University of Madras

R SUBRAHMANYA AYYAR LECTURES

ON THE

HISTORY OF ŚRĪ VAISNAVAS

DELIVERED BY

THE LATE MR. T. A. GOPINAṬHA RAO, M.A.,

ON THE 17TH AND 18TH DECEMBER 1917

MADRAS
PIRNTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PRESS

1923

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

		Page.
1.	The Traditional Account	1—7
2.	The Traditional History of the Ācāryas	7—16
3.	A Critical Account of the Śrī Vaiṣṇavas	16—29
4.	The Ācāryas	29—43
5.	Appendix	44—55
6.	Notes	56—57
7.	Remarks by the Chairman	58—61

University of Madras.

SIR SUBRAHMANYA AYYAR LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF ŚRĪ VAISNAVAS

DELIVERED BY

THE LATE MR. T. A. GOPINATHA RAO, M.A.,

ON THE 17TH AND 18TH DECEMBER 1917.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,—Before proceeding with the lecture I must express my sense of deep obligation to the Syndicate of the Madras University for the honour (which I value highly) done to me in having been asked to deliver these lectures. To me the value of the honour is immeasurably enhanced by the feelings of profound and grateful respect cherished by me for the venerable gentleman with whose name this lectureship is associated. I am only too well aware of the inadequacy of my qualifications for the proper discharge of the task with which I am entrusted. But I may mention that my object in having ventured to address you on this occasion is not so much to give instruction as to provoke thought and induce others to work in such and kindred fields of research, and I shall consider myself amply rewarded if these lectures induce some of you at least to tackle the obscure points in the history of our land and add to the present stock of knowledge.

It is just twelve years ago that my article on the history of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas first attracted the attention of our revered countryman, Dr. Sir S. Subrahmanya Ayyar, who has ever since taken a paternal interest in me and watched with a kindly eye my humble labours in the field of historical research. There has since been much progress in epigraphy, necessitating the revision in the light of new facts of some of the conclusions at which I had then arrived. It is some satisfaction to me, however, that almost all the new materials that have gone to demolish my former conclusions and helped me to reconstruct a more correct history have been collected by myself. It is my object to discuss in two lectures the history of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas so far as it can be gathered from all available sources and, with your permission, I now proceed to do so.

THE TRADITIONAL ACCOUNT.

Having made several repeated attempts to set right erring humanity, Viṣṇu resolved upon sending the various Insignia

attached to Him and caused them to be born on the earth at different places and times and among different castes with a view to the betterment and ennoblement of the human beings under his sway. According to the order of appearance the following could be named: *Gadā, Śaṅkha* and *Nandaka* were ordained to appear in the forms of Bhūtam, Poygai and Pēyāḻvārs, respectively, and at Kāñci, Kaḍaṉmallai and Mayilai. These were succeeded in the order of time by Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār into whose form the *Cakra* incarnated: he, as his name suggests, was a native of Tirumaḻiśai, the Sanskrit equivalent of which is Mahīsārakṣētra. Next was Nammāḻvār, the embodiment of Viṣvaksēna hailing from Tirukkurukūr in the south. Kulaśēkhara, born in the royal family of the Kēraḷas, is believed to have emanated from the *Kaustubha* of Viṣṇu. He was followed by Periyāḻvār who graced Śrīvilliputtūr and in whom *Garuḍa* is believed to have been impersonated. Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi and Tirumaṅgai, appearing afterwards in the villages of Maṇḍaṅguḍi and Tirukkuṟaiyalūr, were the counterparts of *Vanamālā* and *Sārṅga*. The last Āḻvār, a citizen of Uṟaiyūr, has the name of Tirupāṇāḻvār. To this list are generally added the following:—Āṇḍāḷ, the daughter of Periyāḻvār, and Madurakavi, the disciple of Nammāḻvār.

What is apparent from the above is the fact that the Āḻvārs came from all parts of the Madras Presidency and that they consisted of seven Brāhmaṇas, one Kṣatriya, two Śūdras and one of a low caste called the Pāṇar. According to the *Guruparamparās* the activities of these Āḻvārs were spread over several centuries.

Let me attempt to give a brief account of these Āḻvārs.

Poygaiyāḻvār, the *Avatār* of Viṣṇu's conch, was born at Kāñcipuram, within a flower, on Saturday corresponding to the Śravaṇa nakṣatra of the bright half of the month Āśvayuja in the year Siddārthi, the year 861902 of Dvāparayuga (B.C. 4202).

Bhūtattāḻvār, coming next in the order of time, was born the next day after the birth of Poygaiyāḻvār, the nakṣatra of his nativity being Dhaniṣṭhā. He was also born in a flower at a place even then known as Kaḍaṉmallai (Mahābalipuram).

Pēyāḻvār was the third, being born on the third day of the birth of the first Āḻvār, under the auspices of Śatabhiṣaṅ nakṣatra and descended from the same parent as the first two at Mayilai (modern Mylapore).

All these three were born in the Brāhmaṇa caste.

These three were born *yōgis* originating in floral parts, and after attaining manhood met casually one day at Tirukkōvalūr in the following manner. Poygai who had come there on a pilgrimage was resting on a narrow pial in the temple of that place. At the same pial and with the same love of pilgrimage Bhūtattāḻvār sought shelter for the night. Sleeping accommodation not being quite sufficient for the two pilgrims, they agreed to sit through

the whole night, when the third Pēyāḻvār aimed at the same place, being hurried thither by the symptoms of an approaching storm in the night. On the pial which could contain these three pilgrims in a standing position they agreed to be in this posture throughout the night. In the course of a conversation into which they had entered, it appeared to them that they felt the elbowing of another addition, wishing to share the already overcrowded pial. This fourth person was no less than Hari (Viṣṇu) who appeared before their mind's eye as if to remind them of Him and this figure vanished at once. This divine arrival occasioned the singing of a centum of Tamiḻ verses by each of the three saints known by the name of *Iyaṟpā Tiruvandādi* and forming part of the *Nālāyira-prabandham.* After this great event in their lives, they met Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār at Tiruvallikēṇi (modern Triplicane) and from there all four repaired to Mayilai, the birth place of Pēyāḻvār, from which place they dispersed once again.

Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār.—Once upon a time the Riṣis went to Brahmā to consult him as regards the best place on earth where they could make a short sojourn for the purpose of carrying on their meditations. After carefully weighing the merits of various places, Brahmā prescribed that Tirumaḻiśai would suit them; accordingly they all went there. The wife of Bhārghava Riṣi gave birth there to a son whom the Riṣi threw away on the way-side. The baby was picked up by one Tiruvāḷaṉ, a man of the Śudra caste. Being childless, he was very glad to bring up the foundling as his own child. It was fed upon the milk supplied gratis by a pious cowherd, to whom also some time after a boy was born. This child was called Kaṇikaṇṇaṉ and he subsequently became a disciple of Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār, the foster-son of Tiruvāḷan.

As the first boy grew in years he learnt that it was necessary to examine critically the various *Darśanas* (systems of philosophy) that were then current, and armed with this preparation he searched for truth in the heterodox systems of Buddhism, Jainism and the Cārvāka philosophy and in the orthodox schools of Śaivaism and Vaiṣṇavaism. At last his restless mind found consolation in Vaiṣṇavaism. Having arrived at this conclusion he is said to have exclaimed, as in the following verse:—

சாக்கியங்கற்றோம் சமணங்கற்றோம் சங்கரனார்
ஆக்கிய வாகமநூலாராய்ந்தோம்—பாக்கியத்தால்
செங்கட்கரியானைச் சேர்ந்தோம் தீதிலமே
எங்கட்கரிய தொன்றில்.

He spent 700 years of his life at Tiruvallikēṇi, where he exhibited his greatness by conquering Śiva, who on that occasion bestowed upon him the title of Bhakti-Sāra. It was at *Tiruvallikēṇi* that he met the three first Āḻvārs and gained their friendship. In their company he paid a visit to Mayilai, the birth place of Pēyāḻvār.

From there he went to Kāñcipuram with Kaṇikaṇṇaṉ whom he took up from his native village.

The reigning Pallava prince of Kāñcipuram having heard of the spiritual greatness of this Āḻvār, appealed to him through his disciple Kaṇikaṇṇaṉ to grant him the boon of eternal youth. The Āḻvār, greatly annoyed by the importunity of the prince, left the capital at once for an adjacent village named Ōrirukkai or Ōriravirukkai, whither the image in the temple of the Pallava capital went to join its devotee. Next morning when the report of the absence of the image of the temple reached the king, he learnt that this calamity was due to the offence he had given to that great man, Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār. Thereupon he apologized to the Āḻvār and succeeded in bringing back to his capital both the image and the Āḻvār. After a short stay in the Pallava capital the saint started on a pilgrimage to Kumbhakōnam where he spent the rest of his life. He left behind him two works in Tamiḻ named the *Tiruccanda-Viruttam* and the *Nānmugan-Tiruvandādi*. He was the incarnation of Sudarśana and is said to have lived for 4,700 years.

Nammāḻvār was born in Tirunagari, a suburb of Tirukkurugai, in the Tinnevelly district, of one Kāri and his wife Uḍaiyanaṅgai, on the forty-third day of the first year of the Kaliyuga which corresponded with a new moon of the Vaiśākha month in the year Bahudānya, B.C. 3102. Like all the abovementioned Āḻvārs he was a born *yōgi*. Even as a child he left his home to take his seat under an adjacent tamarind tree where he continued in *samādhi* for sixteen years.

Madurakavi, a native of Tirukkōḻur and a Brāhmaṇa, learnt at Ayōdhyā, whither he had gone on a pilgrimage, that Nammāḻvār had just then been born in the south. He repaired immediately to Tirunagari to visit this human prodigy and to become his disciple. After Madurakavi's arrival four years and a half were spent by Nammāḻvār in composing the *Tiruvāymoḻi* which the devout disciple took down regularly on palm leaves. According to the *Guruparamparai* of the third Brahmatantra Svatantrasvāmin, Nammāḻvār lived for thirty-five years and Madurakavi survived him for fifty years. Nammāḻvār seems to have begun his task with the firm resolve of composing a thousand verses in Tamiḻ as indicated by the colophon at the end of each decade of his Tiruvāymoḻi. Besides the *Tiruvāymoḻi*, he wrote the smaller works called *Tiruviruttam*, *Tiruviśaippa* and *Periya-Tiruvandādi*. He is variously known as Kāri-māṟaṉ, Śaṭhakōpa, Vakuḻābharaṇa and Parāṅkuśa. Nammāḻvār was the incarnation of Viṣvaksēna and a Śudra by caste.

Kulaśēkharāḻvār.—Kulaśēkhara styles himself as *Kollikāvalan* (the king of Kolli), *Kūḍal-Nāyakan* (the lord of Madura) and *Kōḻikkōn* (the lord of Uṟaiyūr), these names indicating that he had sway over the Kēraḷa, Pāṇḍya and Chōḷa kingdoms. He was born in

Kollinagar on the Malabar Coast as a prince of Kērala in the twenty-eighth year of Kali (B.C. 3075). Remarkable in his devotion to Viṣṇu, he, in the course of time, abdicated his throne in favour of his son and retired to Śrīraṅgam where he is said to have employed himself in the construction of portions of the temple of Raṅganātha. He was the author of the *Perumāḷ-Tirumoḻi* in Tamiḷ and the *Mukundamālā* in Saṅskṛit.

Periyāḻvār flourished in the reign of a Pāṇḍya king named Śrīvallabha ; the original name of Periyāḻvār was Viṣṇucitta. He was the incarnation of Garuḍa, being born at Śrīvilliputtūr in the forty-seventh year of Kali (B.C. 3056). He was presented with a large sum of money as a prize for his triumphant success in a keen religious discussion held in the presence of the king. The title of Bhaṭṭar-Pirāṉ (meaning the best of Brāhmaṇas) was further bestowed on him by the king. His quiet life was spent in cultivating a flower garden in order to dedicate the flowers grown there to the local deity in the form of garlands. One day, coming across a little female child in his garden, he adopted her and brought her up as his own daughter. When the girl came of age, he gave her sound education both on the religious and secular sides and this befitted her to help her foster-father in his devotional exercises. One thing she could not desist from, and that was the inclination to wear the nice garlands made by her father before they were offered to the deity. She would steal away a few moments for the purpose during her father's short absence and would replace the garlands in their original places before her father returned. The father, in ignorance of the garlands having been used by his daughter, dedicated them to the deity. One day he chanced to discover the girl's freaks and chiding her not to repeat this act of sacrilege, did not present the garland that day, but God appearing to him in a dream intimated to him His special pleasure in accepting only such garlands as had been worn by Āṇḍāḷ (Periyāḻvār's daughter) and not any other. From the next day onwards, Periyāḻvār offered only these used garlands. Āṇḍāḷ was given the name of Śūḍikkoḍutta-Nācciyār on account of her wearing the flowers herself before offering them to God. When she reached marriageable age, she refused to marry any one except the God Raṅganātha of the Śrīraṅgam temple. The God appeared to the Āḻvār in a dream to declare before him his acceptance of the girl in marriage and ordered her to be brought to his residence at Srīraṅgam. Periyāḻvār took her there with great *éclat* and left her in her Lord's house and returned to his quiet residence at Śrīvilliputtūr. Periyāḻvār has left a number of Tamiḷ verses which go by the name of the *Periyāḻvār-Tirumoḻi* and the works of Āṇḍāḷ are called the *Nācciyār-Tirumoḻi*.

Tiruppāṇāḻvār.—He was a man of low caste and he had not therefore the privilege to step into the holy precincts of the island

of Śrīraṅgam, but sang the praises of the God Raṅganātha from the southern bank of the Kāvērī. He was a person of a highly devotional temperament, justly honoured by God, who ordered one Lōkasāraṅgamuni to take the Āḷvār to the temple on his shoulders, where he became absorbed into the deity. He has left only ten stanzas in Tamiḷ beginning with the words "*Amalaṉādi-Pirāṉ*, etc." He was born in the 342nd year of the Kaliyuga (B.C. 2760) in Uṟaiyūr, being the *avatār* of Śrīvatsa.

Tirumaṅgai-āḷvār was a *kallar* (professional robber) by birth and profession. He claims to have been a petty chief under the Cōḷa king. For having misappropriated the revenue of the villages he had the tenure of, the king imprisoned him. He got his release by paying off the amount through the assistance of the God Aruḷāḷa-Perumāḷ of Conjeeveram and began a new walk of life—that of a highwayman. While making his livelihood by this nefarious profession, he one day waylaid a newly married couple who were passing through Tirumaṇaṅgollai, his stronghold. He succeeded in dispossessing them of all their valuables excepting a little ring encircling one of the bridegroom's toes, which he tried in vain to pull out with his teeth. Suspecting that the bridegroom had practised some witchcraft, he demanded an explanation from the Brāhmaṇa bridegroom. The latter whispered something in the Āḷvār's ears as the *mantram* he had used for the occasion. The effect of this whisper was indeed magical. The highwayman was instantly converted into a staunch Vaiṣṇava who thenceforward took a vow to visit all Viṣṇu temples to sing their praise and to repair the old temples. Śrīraṅgam temple owes a great deal to the munificence of this Āḷvār, who is said to have built the fourth *prākāra* (the surrounding wall) besides a number of minor buildings. To meet all the expenses of such vast undertakings he plundered the Bauddha Vihāra of Nāgapaṭṭaṇam from which he abstracted the golden image of Buddha, which being melted, served amply for the purpose.

This Āḷvār is claimed in the *Guruparamparai* to have been invited during his visit to Śīrgāḷi (modern Shyali) by Jñānasambandha, the great Śaiva saint, for a religious discussion and that the Vaiṣṇava apostle accepted the challenge and vanquished his Śaiva adversary with no difficulty; whereon Tirumaṅgaiyāḷvār was conducted through Śīrgāḷi, the birth place of Jñānasambandha with all honours.

After a great deal of solicitation and trials of faith, the Āḷvār married Kumudavalli, the daughter of a Vaiṣṇava medical man.

This Āḷvār is said to have been the incarnation of *Karmuka* and was born in the Kali year 397 (B.C. 2714).

Toṇḍaraḍippoḍiyāḷvār.—This Āḷvār was born in the Kali year 289 (B.C. 2814) in a village called Maṇḍaṅguḍi to a Śōḷiya Brāhmaṇa

who called the child Vipranārāyaṇa.* The boy was educated in all the *śāstras* and when he came to manhood he assumed the quiet and unostentatious life of cultivating a flower garden and dedicating the flowers to the God of Śrīraṅgam. He was going on with his work undisturbed, when one day he came across a dancing girl of winning manners and equally tempting features. She was returning with her sister from the court of the Cōḷa king at Uṟaiyūr. On their way home this woman made a bet to her sister saying that she would win everyone by the charm of her beauty, even this austere Vaiṣṇava Saint. With this view in mind she began to serve under him in the improvement of his garden and in course of time she managed to entice him away from his devotions. Before the end of a year poor Vipranārāyaṇa was worse than one of the common herd, having lost all his claims to reverence. All day long his thoughts were centred on her and he had long before relinquished his task of cultivating the flower garden. Months upon months passed away and Vipranārāyaṇa became a totally different person. He became poor and as a consequence was abandoned by his sweet-heart.

Raṅganātha, taking pity on the wretched condition of His devotee, undertook to reclaim him. He assumed one day the form of a temple servant and carried a golden cup belonging to the temple to Vipranārāyaṇa's concubine, presented it to her saying that it was from her lover and that he desired to communicate her his desire to meet her that night. He then told Vipranārāyaṇa that his mistress desired to see him that night. Both met that night and the night was wholly spent in that way. Next morning the loss of the golden cup was brought to the notice of the temple authorities, and on vigilant search it was detected in the house of Vipranārāyaṇa's concubine. Of course Raṅganātha interceded in her behalf (in a dream). Learning the source of his correction to be Raṅganātha, Vipranārāyaṇa regained his senses and thenceforward he remained faithful to his Lord.

The *Guruparamparai* adds that when Tirumaṅgai built the fourth wall of the Śrīraṅgam temple he was obliged to construct it slightly out of its proper alignment, lest he should disturb Toṇḍaradippoḍi's Tulasi-garden, for which kind act the latter expressed his thankfulness personally to Tirumaṅgai.

Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi has left two works in Tamiḻ named the *Tirumālai* and the *Tiruppaḷḷi-eḻuchchi.*

THE TRADITIONAL HISTORY OF THE ĀCĀRYAS.

Nāthamuni.—Long after the time of the Āḻvārs there lived at Āḻvār-Tirunagari one Parāṅkuśadāsa, a disciple of Madurakaviyāḻvār and at the same time there lived at Vīranārāyaṇapuram

* Periyāḻvār also belonged to the same caste.

(modern Kāṭṭu-maṇṇārkōyil) a Brāhmaṇa named Nāthamunigaḷ. This Nāṭhamuni had a son called Īśvaramuni who was so named after his grandfather. Both of them were learned men and had done enough travelling in visiting places of pilgrimage. This family settled down quietly at Vīranārāyaṇapuram after a protracted pilgrimage. One day some Vaiṣṇava pilgrims from some place in the west happened to go there and to recite ten verses from the *Tiruvāymoḻi* before the local deity; at the end of this decade it was stated that it was a portion of the thousand verses composed by Śathakōpa. After hearing them, Nāthamuni questioned them if they knew the whole work of Śaṭhakōpa by heart. They returned a negative reply but assured him that he would succeed in procuring the work if he should only try for it in the birthplace of Nammāḻvār. With a keen desire to possess a copy of it he undertook a journey to Āḻvār Tirunagari and with some difficulty met Parāṅkuśadāsa and waited upon him; the latter was pleased with him, taught him the secret of securing the works for which he had come there. Nāthamuni by repeating certain verses twelve thousand times received directly from Nammāḻvār himself not only the works of his own composition, but also those of the other Āḻvārs.

Having got the works of all the Āḻvārs from Nammāḻvār, Nāthamuni returned to his native village, Vīranārāyaṇapuram, and resolved to set the verses to music, in which work he was assisted by his nephews Mēlaiyagattāḻvār and Kīḻaiyagattāḻvār. Nāthamuni's fame reached Gaṅgaikoṇḍacōḻapuram and the Cōḻa king of that place began to hold him in respect. During one of his visits to Gaṅgaikoṇḍacōḻapuram, the capital of the Cōḻa king, Nāthamuni breathed his last.

Āḻavandār.—Nāthamuni's grandson was Yāmunārya. He was born some time after the death of his grandfather and of his disciple Uyyakkoṇḍār. He grew up to be a prodigy under the tuition of one Mahābhāṣya-Bhaṭṭa. Akkiyāḻvāṉ, the high priest of the Cōḻa king, had imposed a tax on all learned men of whom Mahābhāṣya Bhaṭṭa was one. When once the priest sent his servants to demand his dues from the teacher of Yāmunācārya, the boy refused payment and in the absence of his teacher sent a challenge on behalf of his teacher to the king's priest for a discussion on any subject he might choose. The challenge was accepted and in the discussion the poor priest had the worst of it at the hands of the boy. The queen who was one of the audience was so overcome with wonder and joy at a mere boy defeating an elderly man considered to be a mountain of learning, that she embraced him and called him her Āḻavandār (deliverer). Thenceforth he was better known by this surname which was conferred on him by the queen.

His further education was taken up by the five disciples of his grandfather who had enjoined upon them to impart what they had received from him to his grandchild.

Armed with this great store of learning, he entered the service of the king and was left in charge of a portion of the Cōḷa dominions. In his latter years he assumed the *Sannyāsāśrama* and retired to Śrīraṅgam at the instance of Maṇakkālnambi, one of his grandfather's disciples.

Rāmānuja.—In Śaka 939, on a Thursday corresponding to Pañcamī of the bright fortnight of the month of Caitra in the year Naḷa, Rāmānuja was born at Śrīperumbūdūr, to Āsūri Kēśava Perumāḷ and his wife Bhūmipiraṭṭiyār. Eight years afterwards in the year Krōdhana, was born his cousin Gōvinda at Maḷalaimaṅgalam. Kēśava Perumāḷ gave his son the necessary preliminary education and sent him to Conjeeveram to attend the lectures on Vēdānta delivered by one Yādavaprakāśa. His cousin Gōvinda joined him later. On more than one occasion Rāmānuja was obliged to differ from the interpretation given by his teacher to certain passages and this difference enraged his master so much that it is asserted in the *Guruparamparai* that he contrived a scheme by which he could do away with Rāmānuja by drowning him in the Ganges. With this object in view Yādavaprakāśa resolved to go on a pilgrimage with his pupils. The unsuspecting Rāmānuja also followed him but was warned in time by Gōvinda and effecting his escape Rāmānuja returned home. From that time onwards, following his mother's advice Rāmānuja went on with his studies unassisted.

The rising greatness of Rāmānuja was heard by Āḷavandār who sent his disciple Tiruvaraṅgapperumāḷ Araiyar to Kāñcipuram to persuade Rāmānuja to go over to Śrīraṅgam. Rāmānuja in his turn had heard of Āḷavandār and was equally desirous of seeing him. When this opportunity arrived, he accompanied Tiruvaraṅgapperumāḷ Araiyar, specially sent by him to fetch Rāmānuja to Śrīraṅgam and when he reached the place, alas! he heard that the grand old man had died a few hours back. Afflicted with intense pain and sorrow he attended the funeral and returned to Kāñci after the ceremony was over.

Rāmānuja pursued his studies for some time privately and then determined upon studying under Periyanambi one of the disciples of Āḷavandār as his teacher. For this purpose he started for Śrīraṅgam, but on his way he met Periyanambi himself at Madurāntakam, where the latter had halted on his way to Kāñci. Rāmānuja filled with joy at such an unexpected meeting requested Periyanambi to begin his lectures even at Madurāntakam at that very auspicious moment. After a short stay here, Rāmānuja returned to Kāñci with Periyanambi and continued studying under him for six months. Meanwhile differences arose between

the wives of the two, and Periyanambi consequently quitted the house of Rāmānuja and returned to Śrīraṅgam.

Disgusted with the many acts of petty-mindedness of his wife, Rāmānuja resolved to take on the robe of the *Sannyāsin* and carried out his resolution immediately and his wife returned to her parents. Having heard that Rāmānuja had entered the *Sannyāsāśrama*, his nephew Mudaliyāṇḍāṇ and Kūrattāḻvāṇ, a brillant youth of the village of Kūram, joined him to begin the study of Vēdānta. It must be noticed here that Mudaliyāṇḍāṇ is said to have been born in the sixteenth year of Rāmānuja's life and Kūrattāḻvār was three years older than Mudaliyāṇḍāṇ. During the period of Rāmānuja's life a discussion arose between him and his old teacher, Yādavaprakāśa about the use of *taptamudrā* in which the latter was completely silenced. A few weeks later Yādavaprakāśa embraced Viśiṣṭādvaitism and became a disciple of Rāmānuja and assumed the name of Gōvindajīyar. He wrote a work called the *Yatidharmasamuccaya* and a short time after quitted the world.

At the request of Tiruvaraṅgapperumāḷ Araiyar, Rāmānuja left Conjeeveram to make thenceforth Śrīraṅgam his headquarters. He assumed the control of the temple and introduced many wholesome reforms in its management. Through the influence of his uncle Periya-Tirumalai Nambi, Rāmānuja's cousin Gōvinda Bhaṭṭar, who set up in his native village of Muḷalaimaṅgalam a *liṅga* which he had brought from Benares and who remained a staunch Saiva, serving in the famous Śiva temple at Kāḷahasti as its manager, was converted to Vaiṣṇavism; after which the neophyte gave up the management of the temple at Kāḷahasti and joined Rāmānuja at Srīraṅgam and became a *Sannyāsin* under the name of Embār.

About this period, a great Advaita philosopher named Yajñamūrti, who was going round to various places both for pilgrimage and for spreading and establishing his faith, heard of Rāmānuja as the propounder of a new system of philosophy and went to him In the discussion that ensued, Yajñamūrti admitted his inferiority and became a disciple of Rāmānuja and in time he became one of his important disciples. After his conversion he received the name of Aruḷāḷaperumāl-Emberumāṇār. He was the author of the *Jñānasāra* and the *Pramēyasāra*.

Now Rāmānuja was moved by a desire to start on an extensive pilgrimage to visit all the 108 shrines sacred to the Vaiṣṇavas. He visited all the important places of the Southern Presidency, and the *Guruparamparai* adds that he even went to Kashmere to procure a copy of the *Bōdhāyana Vṛtti* on Vyāsa's *Brahma-sūtras* after the study of which he intended to write his *Śri Bhāṣya*. It is said that there he received greater honour from the king and the goddess Śāradā than they had both accorded to Śaṅkarācārya. He was able to borrow a copy of the Vṛtti, but only for a short time, even during which his two disciples Kūrattāḻvār and Mudaliyāṇḍāṇ

managed to get it by heart. With that remembrance they were able to help their teacher in the writing of his *opus magnum*, the *Śrī Bhāṣyam*. He returned to Śrīraṅgam and began his Bhāṣyam and finished two-thirds of it. About this period a son was born to Kūrattāḷvār, Parāśarabhaṭṭa by name, who became on the death of Rāmānuja the representative of Viśiṣṭādvaita School of Philosophy.

The *Rāmānujārya Divyasūricaritai* declares that after the Bhāṣyam was completed Rāmānuja lived at Śrīraṅgam for sixty years before the Cōḷa persecution began. At that period there lived a Cōḷa king who was a very bigoted Śaiva. He was compelling his subjects to embrace Śaivism. Nālūrāṉ, the minister of the king, who was one of the persecuted men, pointed out to the king that if their leader Rāmānuja of Śrīraṅgam were converted, it would be as good as converting the whole of his followers. This suggestion was received with favour and emissaries were sent to Śrīraṅgam to fetch Rāmānuja to the capital. When these arrived at Srīraṅgam Rāmānuja was at his bath and Kūrattāḷvāṉ foreseeing trouble to his teacher put on the *kāṣāya* which Rāmānuja had doffed and proceeded to the capital to personate the Vaiṣṇava teacher. The Cōḷa king ordered him to sign a document to the effect that there was no god superior to Śiva ; to which Kūrattāḷvāṉ replied by saying that greater than Śiva was Drōṇa, punning on the words *Śiva* and *Drōna*, which also were two cubic measures of which the latter is bigger in capacity. Incensed at this impertinent reply, the king ordered the eyes of the man to be put out.

To return to Rāmānuja : After his daily services were over he heard the news of the arrival of the royal messengers and of the departure of Kūrattāḷvān to the Cōḷa capital. The devout followers of the Ācārya advised him to flee altogether from the Cōḷa dominions to be out of the reach of harm. He received the advice of his disciples with due regard and left Śrīraṅgam and after a great deal of privation and troubles on the way, reached Toṇḍaṉūr in the Hoysaḷa kingdom where he took refuge. Toṇḍaṉūr (modern Tonnūr near Mēlakōṭe) became thenceforth his headquarters for a great number of years. In the course of a year or two he succeeded in effecting the conversion of Biṭṭidēva, the Hoysaḷa king, from Jainism to Śrī-Vaiṣṇavism and conferred on his royal convert the name of Viṣṇuvardhana. With the help of the king he built on Yādavādri, the temple of Tirunārāyaṇa in the Śaka 1012 Bahudānya. The *Vaḍakalai Sampradāyam* gives 1021 as the date of this event. He constructed also a large lake near Tonnūr and called it Tirumala Sāgara.

In the year Śaka 1039 Mudaliyāṇḍaṉ was sent to the Hoysaḷa capital to set up there, as also in other parts of the empire, five images of Nārāyaṇa. In Bēlūr was set up Vijayanārāyaṇa and Kīrtinārāyaṇa at Talakāḍ.

It is said that these images were set up in Jaina temples converted into places of Vaiṣṇava worship.

After all these achievements were over, people arrived with the happy news of the death of the persecuting Cōḷa at Gaṅgaikoṇḍacōḷapuram and requested Rāmānuja to return to Śrīraṅgam. After setting right the affairs of the Tirunārāyaṇapuram temple, he proceeded to Śrīraṅgam where he finished the remaining third of the *Śrī Bhāṣyam* and lived for 11 years before he breathed his last.

Rāmānuja had heard in Śaka 1009 that the Cōḷa king Śeṇṇi Kulōttuṅga had destroyed the Viṣṇu temple at Chidambaram and that its image therein had been carried by its votaries to Tirupati, where it had remained with them houseless. He is said to have influenced his royal convert Ghattidēva Yādavarāya to erect a temple for it in Tirupati and got it set up there. Ghaṭṭidēva Yādavarāya was also requested to superintend the services of the temple. Rāmānuja then settled the dispute about the identity of the image of the Tirumala temple, which the Śaivas claimed as that of Subrahmaṇya and the Vaiṣṇavas asserted to be of Veṅkatēśa. Of course his judgment was in favour of the Vaiṣṇavas. He also established a number of Śrī Vaiṣṇava families at Iḷamaṇḍayam, a village near Tirupati, which he purchased for the purpose.

On the eve of his long life Rāmānuja made Parāśara Bhaṭṭar, the son of Kūrattāḷvār, his successor in teaching the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy and left this world in Śaka 1059.

Bhaṭṭar was the next Ācārya and he was fit by education and intelligence to occupy the seat of his illustrious predecessor. The important event of this period is the conversion of a famous Advaita philosopher of some place in the Mysore Province, who some time after his conversion took holy orders under the name of Nañjīyar and succeeded Bhaṭṭar in the pontifical seat. Nañjīyar made Nambūr Varadarāja the next pontiff. He went by the names of Nambiḷḷai and Lōkācārya. Among his disciples were Periyavāccāṉ Piḷḷai, the author of the voluminous commentaries on the Prabandham, and Piṉbaḷagiya Jīyar the author of the earliest of the Tamil *Guruparamparā prabhāvams*.

The Vaḍagalai hierarchy is traced from Tirukkurugaippirāṉ Piḷḷāṉ, one of the chief disciples of Rāmānuja. He was the son of the maternal uncle of Rāmānuja and was entrusted by the latter with the duty of teaching the *Prabandhas* and their meanings and also with the honour of giving instruction in the *Śrībhāṣya*. These distinctions were shared by three other persons. Tirukkurugaippirāṉ Piḷḷāṉ was the first commentator on the *Tiruvoymoḷi* and all subsequent commentaries are based upon his gloss and are mere elaborations of this the earliest and most authoritative commentary. Eṅgaḷāḷvāṉ, a learned Śōḻiya Brāhmaṇa of Tiruveḷḷarai, was ordered by Rāmānuja to place himself under the guidance of Tirukkurugaippirāṉ Piḷḷāṉ. After the death of the

latter, the former became the pontiff in his line. The disciple and successor of Eṅgaḷāḷvāṉ was Nadādūr Ammāḷ, the grandson of Nadādūr-Āḷvān, a nephew of Rāmānuja. He was succeeded by the great Vēdānta Deśika, the founder of the Vadakalai sect.

After Maṇavāḷamāmunikaḷ in the Teṅgalai line and Vēdānta Dēśika in the Vaḍakalai line, the hierarchy becomes more complicated and to trace each one of the branches is not possible in the short time at our disposal. The history of the period subsequent to these two ācāryas must therefore be reserved for a future occasion.

Among the three important sects of Hindus in Southern India, the Śrīvaisṇavas alone had developed a high order of historical sense. The members of this sect have left behind remarkable records embodying a fairly full and accurate history which is truly Boswellian in its tenderness and photographic in its fidelity and forms a refreshing contrast to the accounts left by the other sectarians. These records are abundant, and the historian of the religions of India has only to co-ordinate the facts contained in them with those disclosed from epigraphical and other sources. Wherever they were not sure of their history, the Śrīvaiṣṇava chroniclers have somewhat freely indented upon their imagination; it is however, easy to detect such occasions and to set such portions of history on firmer foundations with the more reliable indications obtained from epigraphical sources and astronomical calculations.

The Śrīvaiṣṇava movement has several features of great interest to the historian of the religious movements in India. The first and foremost of these is its popular side. Having noticed the remarkable success gained by Buddhism and Jainism over the masses by the employment of the vernacular languages, the Śaiva saints of Southern India copied their example in making religious appeals to the people. The experiment proved a phenomenal success, so much so that people flocked to this creed deserting Buddhism and Jainism. Seeing the success achieved by Śaivaism, the Vaiṣṇavas in their turn employed Tamil, the vernacular language of Southern India, in their religious propaganda with equally marked success.

The second feature of the utmost importance in the history of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas is the catholicity of its tenets. The Śrīvaiṣṇavas hold that there is no distinction of caste so far as learning and character go and a brāhmaṇa may accept as his teacher a *pulaya*, provided the latter possesses the necessary culture and character. To this extent, the caste system was done away with, though not for other purposes. This free receiving and imparting of knowledge from and to men of all castes is voiced in the *Tirumālai* of Toṇḍaraḍippoḍiyāḷvār thus:—

பழுதிலா வொழுகலாற்றுப் பலசதுப் பேதிமார்கள் !
இழிகுலத் தவர்களேது வெம்மடியார்களாகில்

தொழுமினீர் கொடுமின் கொள்மினென்று நின்னோடுமொக்க
வழிபட வருளினாய்போல் மதிள் திரு வரங்கத்தானே.

and by Nammāḷvār in the following lines :—

குலந்தாங்கு சாதிகள் நாலிலும் கீழிழிந்து எத்தனை
நலந்தானிலாத சண்டாள சண்டாளர்களாகிலும்
வலந்தாங்கு சக்கரத்தண்ணல் மணிவண்ணற் காளென்றுள்
கலந்தார் அடியார் தம்மடியா ரெம்மடிகளே.

Instances of such respect offered to men of the so-called low castes are many and striking throughout the history of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas.

The sources of information for the construction of the history of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas are threefold, namely :—

(1) The *Guruparamparās* and monographs on individual Ācāryas, of which the most important are,

(*a*) The *Divyasūri-carita* of Garuḍavāhana Paṇḍita ; this is the oldest extant work on the hierarchy of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas written by one who claims to be a contemporary of Śrī Rāmānuja. There is no mention in this work of the years and *yugas*, but it contains barely the name of the month, *tithi* and *nakṣatra* of the birth of each of the Āḷvārs and the Ācāryas ; nor does Garuḍavāhana Paṇḍita give the chronograms *dhīrlabdhā* and *dharmōnaṣṭaḥ* corresponding to the birth and demise of Rāmānuja. It stops with the statement that Rāmānuja, after finishing the mission of his life, was awaiting his end.

(*b*) Next in order of importance and age is the *Guruparampara-prabhāvam* of Pinbaḷakiya-Perumāḷ Jīyar. It is written in *maṇi-pravāḷam*, a mixture of Sanskrit and Tamil and is based upon the *Divyasūri-caritam* of Garuḍavāhana Paṇḍita, which the author quotes frequently. Piṇbaḷagiya-Perumāḷ Jīyar also does not give the years and the *yugas* in which the Āḷvārs and Ācāryas are said to have been born in later works, but he gives for the first time the chronograms *dhīrlabdhā* and *dharmōnaṣṭah* for the initial and the final dates of the life of Rāmānuja. Piṇbaḷagiya Perumāḷ Jīyar was the disciple of Nambiḷḷai, who, it will be shown later on, lived at the time of the Musalman invasion of Śrīraṅgam in the early part of the 14th century and died immediately after this incident.

(*c*) The *Rāmānujārya-divya-charitam* by Piḷḷailōkaṇ Jīyar is another work dealing with the life of Rāmānuja written in Tamil. Written long after Rāmānuja's time, it contains a great deal of popular and traditional stories which are responsible for minor discrepancies and anachronisms. This work gives some quotations from a more ancient Tamil work of historic value, but it has not been possible to trace either the name of its author or of the work itself. This Piḷḷailōkaṇ-Jīyar is also the author of the *Yatīndrapravaṇa-prabhāvam*, the life of Maṇavāḷamāmunikaḷ.

(*d*) The *Periya-tirumudiyadaivu*, which gives short accounts of all the Śrīvaiṣṇava Āḻvārs and Ācāryas in a very brief and succinct manner and which is an excellent hand-book of reference regarding the teachers of the Śrīvaiṣṇava sect, is the work of Āṇbiḷḷai Kandāḍaiyappan and is written in Tamil. The author was the son of Kandāḍai Aṇṇaṇ who was one of the eight chief disciples of Maṇavāḷamāmunikaḷ.

(*e*) The *Upadēśa-ratna-mālai* of Maṇavāḷamāmunigaḷ is another work of importance as it gives the list of the Āḻvārs and Ācāryas, the *nakṣatra*, etc., of their birth and other useful information regarding them. It is written in Tamil verse.

(*f*) The *Yatīndrapravaṇa-prabhāvam* of Piḷḷailōkaṇ-Jīyar deals, as has already been mentioned, entirely with the life and doings of Maṇavāḷamāmunikaḷ, and is in Tamil.

(*g*) The Saṅskṛit work *Prapannāmṛtam* is another *Guruparamparā* composed by Anantācārya, a descendant of Vaḍuganambi, one of the disciples of Rāmānuja; he was himself the disciple of the grandson of the famous Lakṣmīkumāra or Kōṭikanyakā-dānam Tātācārya of Conjeeveram and lived a little later than the Vijayanagara King Veṅkaṭapatidēvarāya I.

(*h*) The next work of importance is the *Guruparamparā-prabhāvam* of the third Brahmatantra-svatantra Jīyar. This is the Vaḍagalai version of the Śrīvaiṣṇava hierarchy and deals only with one branch, namely, that represented by the school of Vēdānta-Dēśika.

(*i*) There is yet another work, the Saṅskṛit *Vēdāntadēśika-vaibhava-prakāśikā* of Doḍḍayācārya of Cōḷaśiṅgapuram, dealing with the life and times of the great founder of the Vaḍagalai sect, namely, Vēdāntadēśika.

(2) The second source of information concerning the Āḻvārs is the collection of their works, well-known as the *Nālāyiraprabandham*. There incidentally occurs in it some mention of either contemporary events or past incidents, the names and achievements of some kings, which help us in determining limits to the age of the Āḻvārs. The commentaries on the *Divya-prabandham* and more especially that on the *Tiruvāymoḻi* of Nammāḻvār, are replete with reminiscences of the sayings and doings of the Ācāryas and are an invaluable aid to the historian as they afford not only an insight into the history of personages, but also throw a flood of light upon some hitherto little understood customs and manners of a by-gone age and elucidate the meaning of several obscure words and phrases.

(3) The third and most reliable source of information is epigraphy. The inscriptions found scattered over the Presidency are of great corroborative value in regard to the statements made by the various Guruparamparās.

Thus then we have the *Guruparamparās*, the Tamil compositions of the Āḷvārs themselves and the epigraphical records to help us in the construction of the history of the Śrīvaishṇavas.

Having indicated the sources of information for a correct compilation of the Śrīvaiṣṇava history, I shall now proceed to give a brief and succinct analysis of the contents of the *Guruparamparās*, so that their accuracy may be tested in the light of epigraphical and other evidence.

A CRITICAL ACCOUNT OF THE ŚRĪ VAIṢṆAVAS.

The traditional account of the Āḷvārs and the Ācāryas given above facilitates the discussion of the question of their age, the estimate of their literary and other merits and the value to be attached to their works in the formation of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school of philosophy.

The order in which the Āḷvārs are said to have been born is given by Maṇavāḷamāmuni (மணவாளமாமுனிகள்) in the following verse:—

பொய்கையார் பூதத்தார் பேயார் புகழ்மழிசை
அய்யனருள் மாறன் சேரலர்கோன் — துய்யபட்ட
நாதனன்பர்தாள் தூளி நற்பாணன் நன்கலியன்
ஈதிவர்தோற்றத் தடைவாமிங்கு.

The earliest of the Āḷvārs, Pēyāḷvār (பேயாழ்வார்), Bhūtattāḷvār (பூதத்தாழ்வார்) and Poykaiyāḷvār (பொய்கையாழ்வார்), who are known among the Śrīvaiṣṇavas as the Mudalāḷvārs and also their contemporary, Tirumaḷiśaiyāḷvār (திருமழிசையாழ்வார்) are said to have been born in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam (தொண்டைமண்டலம்) in the Dvāpara-yuga and to have lived at the time of the Pallava dominancy over that region. We know from history that the Pallavas first came to Kāñci not earlier than the 4th century A.D., a fact which certainly militates against the statement of the *Guruparamparā* that they were born in the Dvāpara-yuga. Bhūtattāḷvār (பூதத்தாழ்வார்) refers to Māmallai (மாமல்லை) his own birth place, in his work. This place is the same as the modern Mahābalipuram, a sea-port established by the Pallava king Narasiṁhavarman I, surnamed Mahāmalla (மஹாமல்ல). Regarding the town of Māmallai, Prof. Jouveau Dubreuil, the latest authority on the history of the Pallavas, is of opinion that "this town did not probably exist before the time of Narasiṁhavarman I and that it is this king that founded it and gave it the name of Māmallapuram (மாமல்லபுரம்) after his own name of Māmalla and began the cutting of the *Rathas* and caves therein." Bhūtattāḷvār (பூதத்தாழ்வார்), therefore, was probably born some time after Māmallapuram (மாமல்லபுரம்) came into existence. Mahāmalla (மஹாமல்ல) lived in the middle of the 7th century and therefore Bhūtattāḷvār (பூதத்தாழ்வார்) and his contemporaries may be assigned to a period later than the middle of the seventh century of the Christian era.

Again, Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār (திருமழிசையாழ்வார்) mentions the Śramaṇas, the Bauddhas and the Śivabhaṭārakas (சிவபடாரர்). Buddhism and Jainism had not come into being in the Dvāpara yuga ; and the Āḻvār who refers to these religions cannot have lived earlier than Buddha. *It is patent that these earlier Āḻvārs* did not live in a very remote antiquity, the more so if we realise that Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār (திருமழிசையாழ்வார்) has a verse[*] which seems to be an adaptation from the famous Tirukkuṛaḷ, (திருக்குறள்), a work which belonged to the Śaṅgam (சங்கம்) period, and which has been variously dated, from the 2nd to the 6th century A.D.

Another point worth noticing in this connexion is that some of the earlier Pallavas were devotees of Śiva and are described in their copper-plate grants as *parama-mahēśvaras* (பரம மாஹேஸ்வர) Mahēndravarman I (மஹேந்திரவர்மன்) was a Śaiva and excavated several cave temples for the worship of Śiva in a number of districts of our Presidency. His son Narasiṁhavarmaṉ and the later Pallavas, Dantivarman (தந்திவர்மன்), Nandivarman (நந்திவர்மன்) and Nṛpatuṅgavarman (நிருபதுங்கவர்மன்) were, however, Vaiṣṇavas and are called in their copper-plate inscriptions *Haricaraṇa-parah*, (ஹரிசரணபர:), *Dridhabhaktir-Muradviṣi* (த்ரிடபக்திர் முரத்விஷி) and so on. Paramēśvaravarman II (பரமேஸ்வரவர்மன்) built the Viṣṇu temple now known as the Vaikuṇthapperumal (வைகுண்டப்பெருமாள்) temple at Kāñci and it was praised by Tirumaṅgaiyāḻvār (திருமங்கை யாழ்வார்) under the name of Paramēccura-viṇṇakaram (பரமேச்சுர விண்ணகரம்). All things considered, the Pallava period, corresponding to the first quarter of the 8th century of the Christian era, appears certainly to have been one of great Vaiṣṇava activity all over the Presidency, in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam (தொண்டைமண்டலம்) as well as in the Pāṇḍya and Cola countries. It would not be wrong, therefore, to assign the Mudal-āḻvārs and also Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār (திருமழிசையாழ்வார்) to this period.

The later *Guruparamparās* (குருபரம்பரா) add to the astronomical details given in the earlier ones the years of the Kaliyuga era and the cyclic years corresponding to the birth of the Āḻvārs and Ācāryas. The Kali years are mere fictions of the later writers, whereas the cyclic years and the *pañcāṅga* seem to work satisfactorily in some cases and seem to yield fairly consistent results. Diwan Bahadur Mr. L. D. Swāmikkannu Pillai, our learned chairman, has made the necessary calculations[†] and has published a paper embodying his results in the *Journal of the S. I. Association. In it* he assigns A.D 720, to the Mudal-āḻvārs (முதலாழ்வார்) and Tirumaḻiśaiyāḻvār (திருமழிசையாழ்வார்), which seems to fit in with the conclusion arrived at above.

---

[*] Compare (வித்துமிடல் வேண்டுங் கொல்லோ விடையடர்த்த பத்தி புழவன் பழம் புனத்து) of Tirumalisaiyar with (வித்துமிடல் வேண்டுங் கொல்லோ விருந்தோம்பி மிச்சில் மிசைவான் புனம்) of the Tirukkural,

[†] See, however, pp. 58, 59, etc., below.

Since the age of the Mudal-āḷvārs (முதலாழ்வார்) were far removed from those of the Ācāryas, the hagiographers of Śrīvaiṣṇavaism could not be definite about the time in which these Āḷvārs flourished nor could they give any account of their parentage. Hence they had to draw upon their imagination for their supposed ages and to attribute to several of them a fanciful origin from flowers, etc. The other evidences however seem to fix fairly the period in which they lived.

From the traditional accounts we learn that—

(i) Nammāḷvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) was the son of Kāri (காரி), who held a high post under the Pāṇḍya king; his mother was a lady belonging to Tiruvaṇpariśāram (திருவண்பரிசாரம்),

(ii) that his disciple was called Madhurakavi (மதுரகவி), and

(iii) that he himself bore the names Kārimāṟan (காரிமாறன்), Parāṅkuśaṉ (பராங்குசன்) and Saṭhakōpaṉ (சடகோபன்), and

(iv) that he was born at Tirukkurugūr (திருக்குருகூர்).

In the year 1906, when I paid a casual visit to the Āṉaimalai (ஆனைமலை) hill near Madura, I chanced to discover two valuable stone inscriptions belonging to the reign of the early Pāṇḍya king Jaṭāvarman Parāntaka Pāṇḍya (ஜடாவர்மன் பராந்தகபாண்டிய). One of these is in Sanskṛit and the other in Tamiḻ. The information contained in the first is supplemented by that contained in the second.

The first record states—

(i) that it belongs to the Kali year 3871 (expired),

(ii) in the reign of the Pāṇḍya king Parāntaka (பராந்தக),

(iii) that his *uttara-mantrin* (உத்தரமந்திரி), the son of Māṟa, a native of the village of Karavandapura and a member of the Vaidya family, excavated a shrine for Viṣṇu and set up an image in it. The son of Māṟa (மாறன்) was also known as Madhurakavi (மதுரகவி) on account of his skill in composing sweet verses.

The second record mentions the facts that seeing that—

(i) the temple works undertaken by his brother were not yet finished at the time of his death, Eyiṇan (எயினன்), when he attained the position of the *uttaramantrin* (உத்தரமந்திரி) took them up and completed them;

(ii) that the document was dated in the reign of Māṟañjaḍaiyan (மாறஞ் சடையன்).

Now, the Kali year given in the inscription corresponds to A.D. 770. This was about the year when Parāntaka Pāṇḍya (பராந்தக பாண்டிய) ascended throne. His father Parāṅkuśa Pāṇḍya (பராங்குச பாண்டிய), who fought with Nandivarman Pallavamalla (நந்திவர்மன் பல்லவமல்ல) at Śaṅkaramaṅgai (சங்கரமங்கை) and other places, about the year A.D. 760, must have died just before 770. Māṟaṅkāri (மாறங்காரி) continued as *uttaramantrin* (உத்தரமந்திரி) for some years in the reign of Parāntaka (பராந்தக) before he died. His death must have taken place within about a decade from 770.

The facts contained in the Aṇaimalai inscriptions are in striking consonance with those found in the Guruparamparâs regarding Nammāḻvār, his father and his disciple. Firstly, the compound name or *iraṭṭai-ppēr* (இரட்டைப்பேர்) Kārimāṟaṉ (காரிமாறன்) of Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) indicates that Kāri was the name of his father. The name Māṟaṅkāri (மாறங்காரி) of the *uttaramantrin* (உத்தரமந்திரி) shows similarly that he was the son of Māṟaṉ (மாறன்). Secondly Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) was called Parāṅkuśa (பராங்குச), which was also the name of the father of the king Parāntaka (பராந்தக). Lastly, the disciple of Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) possessed the name of Madhurakavi (மதுரகவி), a surname of the *uttaramantrin* Māṟaṅkāri (உத்தரமந்திரி மாறங்காரி). Nammāḻvār's (நம்மாழ்வார்) mother comes from Tiruvaṇpariśāram (திருவண்பரிசாரம்), a place not far from Karavandapuram (கரவந்தபுரம்) or Kaḷakkāḍu (களக்காடு). These facts in the accounts of Kāri (காரி), the uttaramantrin (உத்தரமந்திரி) and Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) tempt us to identify Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) as the son of the *uttaramantrin* (உத்தரமந்திரி). Such an identification solves many an otherwise inexplicable difficulty in the life of Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்). If the identification is correct, it is easy to see that Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) was named Māṟaṉ (மாறன்) after his grandfather. It was the custom in ancient days for the kings of South India to honour their faithful and distinguished subordinates in various ways, of which one was to confer upon them the privilege of prefixing to their own names that of their sovereign. Hundreds of instances of this custom could be found in epigraphy and it is also mentioned in Tamil literature. For the distinguished services rendered to him, Parāṅkuśa (பராங்குச) may have been pleased to permit Māṟaṅkāri (மாறன்காரி) to prefix his name to his own or to that of his son. Being already in possession of surnames such as Mūvēndamaṅgala-ppēraraiyan (மூவேந்தமங்கலப் பேரரையன்), etc. Māṟaṅkāri (மாறன்காரி) may have thought it fit to call his son Parāṅkuśa (பராங்குச) after his sovereign. Similarly, Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) may have given his own father's surname Madhurakavi (மதுரகவி) to his disciple as a *dāsya-nāma* and he may have thenceforth come to be known by the name of Madhurakavi (மதுரகவி) his real name being lost to posterity.

It is quite certain that Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) was born at Tirukkurugūr (திருக்குருகூர்) when his father was in charge of that district, but Māṟaṅkāri (மாறங்காரி) himself was a native of Kaḷakkāḍu (களக்காடு). The fact of Nammāḻvār's (நம்மாழ்வார்) birth at Tirukkurugūr (திருக்குருகூர்) need not therefore be considered as militating against the inscriptional statement that Māṟaṅkāri (மாறங்காரி) was a native of Kaḷakkāḍu (களக்காடு).

When I published my article on the Āṇaimalai (ஆனைமலை) inscriptions in Śendamiḻ (செந்தமிழ்) for 1906, the above identifications were attempted by me, but some other considerations

obliged me to abandon them then. I have since been convinced that, for the reasons stated above, the identifications are perfectly valid.

The king Parāntaka (பராந்தக) was himself a very devout Vaiṣṇava, as the Madras Museum plates of that king states. We read of him in that inscription

பராந்தகன் பரமவைஷ்ணவன் ருஷி and
பூஞ்சோலை யணிபுறவிற் காஞ்சிவாய்ப் பேரூர் புக்குத்
திருமாலுக் கமர்ந்துறையக் குன்றமன்னதோர்
கோயிலாக்கியும்

Again, it is stated, that the four concluding verses of the Vēḷvikuḍi (வேள்விகுடி) grant of the same king Parāntaka (பராந்தக) have been quoted from the *Vaiṣṇava Dharma* (வைஷ்ணவதர்ம). The *Viṣṇu Dharma* (விஷ்ணுதர்ம) is a work of authority among the Śrīvaiṣṇavas and the story of Kṣatrabandhu (க்ஷத்திரபந்து) alluded to in his Tirumālai (திருமாலை) by Tonḍaraḍippoḍiyāḷvār (தொண்டரடிப்பொடியாழ்வார்) is given in the 17th chapter of that work. The Vaiṣṇava zeal which this king and his officers evinced was the result of the Vaiṣṇava revival inaugurated in the Pāṇḍya country by Nammāḷvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) and the Mudalāḷvārs (முதலாழ்வார்) in the Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam (தொண்டைமண்டலம்).

One other fact in the life of Nammāḷvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) has now to be considered. There are thirteen Vaiṣṇava places of note in the Malaināḍu (மலைநாடு) which no one but Nammāḷvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) has praised. They are situated in places which were reached in ancient times by three or four mountain passes. One group consisting of Tiruvaṇparisāram (திருவண்பரிசாரம்), Tiruvāṭṭāṟu (திருவாட்டாறு) and Tiruvanandapuram (திருவநந்தபுரம்) was reached by the Ārambōḷy (ஆரம்பொழி) or the Kaḍukkarai (கடுக்கரை) pass; another consisting of Tiruccirrāṟu (திருச்சிற்றாறு) in Ceṅguṉṟūr (செங்குன்றூர்), Tiruppuliyūr (திருப்புலியூர்), Tiruvaṇvaṇḍūr (திருவண்வண்டூர்), Tirukkaḍittānam (திருக்கடித்தானம்), Tiruvallavāḷ (திருவல்லவாழ்) and Tiruvāraṇviḷai (திருவாரன்விளை) was reached by the Accaṅkōyil (அச்சன்கோயில்) pass; while one must come by the Bōḍināyakanūr (போடிநாயகனூர்) pass to reach Tirukkāṭkarai (திருக்காட்கரை) and Tirumūḷikkaḷam (திருமூழிக்களம்). Tirunāvāy (திருநாவாய்) and Tiruvittuvakkōḍu (திருவித்துவக்கோடு) are accessible through the Palghat pass. All these ways are situated even at the present time in thick jungles infested with wild animals and are not easily passed through. It must have been much more difficult of access in earlier days. The inaccessibility of these Vaiṣṇava shrines accounts for the fact that they have not been visited by the other Āḷvārs, though some of them have come almost to the foot of the Western Ghats. It became possible for Nammāḷvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) to visit them, because he was the son of a high official of the State and perhaps because he was much respected by the king, who might have sent an escort of powerful soldiers

and staff to enable Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) to visit the places of pilgrimage in Malaināḍu (மலைநாடு).

The astronomical details supplied by the (குருபரம்பரா) *Guru-paramparās* yield the date A.D. 798 for Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) and this date, be it noted, falls in the reign of Parāntaka Pāndya I (பராந்தக பாண்டிய).

In one of his verses Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) appears to show his acquaintance with the Tirukkuṟaḷ (திருக்குறள்) of Tiruvaḷḷuvar (திருவள்ளுவர்). The first half of the verse reads thus:—

> ஊரவர்கவ்வை யெருவிட்டன்னை சொல்நீர்படுத்து
> ஈரநெல்வித்தி முளைத்தநெஞ்சப் பெருஞ்செய் (யுள்)

which is almost the same as

> ஊரவர்கௌவை யெருவாகவன்னை சொல்
> நீராக நீளுமிந்நோய்

of the Kuṟal.

Again Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) mentions elsewhere in his works the Śramaṇas, the Śākyas and the followers of the Liṅga-purāṇa (லிங்கபுராண). This last is a work of recent date. His references to the *avaidika* (அவைதிக) religions and his acquaintance with the *Tirukkuṟal* (திருக்குறள்) would be possible only if we place him well within historic times, but never if we should accept the tradition which places his birth 3,000 years before that of Christ.

There is an inscription engraved upon one of the pillars of the first *prākāra* of the Saurirājapperumāḷ (சௌரிராஜப்பெருமாள்) temple at Tirukkaṇṇapuram (திருக்கண்ணபுரம்) which belongs to the third year of a Cōḷa king who is simply called Rājakēsarivarman (ராஜகேஸரிவர்மன்). From the palæographical point of view the record could be assigned to the reign of Āditya I (ஆதித்ய), who as we know, ruled before A.D. 908. In this inscription a private person bears the name Śaṭhakōpa (சடகோப), which no one before Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) had borne and which appears to have come into existence with Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்). If Śaṭhakōpa (சடகோப), one of the names of Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) was borne by a common man some time before A.D. 908, it is certain that the original Śaṭhakōpa (சடகோப) should have lived fairly long before A.D. 908 so as to allow time for the spread of his glory, and to compel the admiration of people for his worth so that they might be prompted by a desire to bestow on their children the name of so great and saintly a person. If, as we have conjectured already, Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) lived in the first half of the 9th century, it would not be difficult to find ordinary people bearing the name Śaṭhakōpa (சடகோப) in the 10th century A.D.

The various standpoints from which we have viewed the age of Nammāḻvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) point in the aggregate to the first half of the 9th century as the time when he lived and wrote his memorable *Tiruvāymoḻi* (திருவாய்மொழி).

Kulaśēkhara (குலசேகர) was, according to tradition, the next after Nammālvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) in point of time. There is very little of internal evidence in the works of Kulaśēkharālvār (குலசேகராழ்வார்) regarding the age in which he flourished. He styles himself the lord of Kūḍal (கூடல் Madura), of Kongu (கொங்கு), of Koḻi (கோழி) (Uṟaiyūr) and of the city of Kollinagar (கொல்லிநகர்) and thereby claims lordship over the Pāṇḍya, Kongu and the Chōḷa countries. One passage in his work has reference to an historical incident which may serve to fix approximately the age of Kulaśēkhara. It runs thus:—

மல்லைமாநகர்க்கிறைவன்றன்னை வான்செலுத்தி வந்து
ஈங்கனை மாயத்து . . . பிள்ளை செய்வகைகாணு

which Periyavāccāṉ-piḷḷai (பெரியவாச்சான்-பிள்ளை), the great Vaiṣṇava commentator, explains thus :—

மிக்கசம்பத்தையுடைய ஸ்வாப்யமான ஸ்ரீமதுரைக்கு ராஜாவான கம்ஸனை வீரஸ்வர்க்கத்திலே அனுப்பிவிட்டு......

This explanation, however, is wrong. The passage clearly means

குலசேகர பூபதியானவா மல்லைநகர்க்கு ராஜாவாகிற பல்லவனைப்போரிற் கொன்று விண்ணுடு புகவிட்டு, போர்க்களத்தினின்றும் போந்து இங்குள்ள மாயத்தோடுகூடிய பிள்ளையாகிய கண்ணனைக்கண்டு

Here is, therefore, an allusion to the defeat and death of a Pallava king suffered in the hands of Kulaśēkhara (குலசேகர). We know that Nammālvār (நம்மாழ்வார்) lived in the reign of Parāntaka Pāṇḍya I (பராந்தக பாண்டிய), son of Parāṅkuśa Pāṇḍya (பராங்குச பாண்டிய), the contemporary and opponent of Nandivarman Pallavamalla (நந்திவர்மன் பல்லவமல்ல). Since Kulaśēkhara (குலசேகர) is said to be later than Nammālvār (நம்மாழ்வார்), the Pallava contemporary of Kulaśēkhara should be some one later than Nandivarman Pallavamalla (நந்திவர்மன் பல்லவமல்ல). On sufficiently strong grounds Professor Jouveau Dubreuil has shown in his recent publication on the "Pallavas" that "the southern part of the Pallava kingdom was occupied by the Pāṇḍyas from the 4th to the 16th year of the reign of a Pāṇḍya king called Māṟanjaḍaiyaṉ (மாறஞ்சடையன்); it appears to have been a military occupation. We think that the occupation took place at the end of the reign of Danti, about 825." Kulaśēkhara (குலசேகர) may have joined the Pāṇḍya king in assailing and probably also killing the Pallava king Dantivarman (தந்திவர்மன்), some time about A.D. 825. It is perhaps this event that is alluded to in the passage quoted above from the *Perumāl Tirumoḻi* (பெருமாள் திருமொழி). By virtue of his descent on his father's and mother's side, he may have claimed to be the lord of Uṟaiyūr, Kollinagar, etc. The age of Kulaśēkhara has to be placed therefore in first half of the 9th century.

Periyālvār (பெரியாழ்வார்) and his daughter Āṇḍāḷ (ஆண்டாள்) were the contemporaries of a Pāṇḍya king named Śrīvallabhadēva (ஸ்ரீவல்லபதேவ). Mention is also made in their works of a person

who held the surnames Nayācala (நயாசல), and Abhimānatuṅga (அபிமானதுங்க), surnames which sound more like those possessed by kings than by common men. The Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition makes them the surnames of a Śelvaṇ (செல்வன்), who is said to have been the priest of the king. If so, we should understand that those titles which belonged to him were conferred by the king on his priest as an honour. The only source of information regarding the Pāṇḍyas we possess at present are the two Śinnamaṇūr (சின்னமனூர்) plates and the Vēḷvikuḍi (வேள்விகுடி) grant. According to the larger Śinnamaṇūr (சின்னமனூர்) grant, there was a king named Śrīvallabha (ஸ்ரீவல்லப) *alias* Māṟa (மாற) and Paracakrakōlāhala (பரசக்கிரகோலாகல) who was the son of Varaguṇa (வரகுண) Pāṇḍya and who was a distinguished sovereign in his line. The document describes him thus :—

तत्रासीदरिकेसरी नरपतिर्व्वंशे वशी श्रीनिधि-
स्तत्पुत्रो जटिलस्सुतोस्य नृपतिः श्रीराजसिंहः कृती ।
प्राज्ञ स्स्फलीतपराक्रमो वरगुणस्तस्यात्मजस्तत्सुतः
श्रीमारः श्रवणीयकीर्त्तिरजितः श्रीवल्लभो भूपतिः ॥

Only one stone inscription of this king Śrīvallabha (ஸ்ரீவல்லப) has been discovered up to this time; it is engraved on a rock-cut shrine at Śittaṇṇavāśal (சித்தண்ணவாசல்) in the Pudukkōṭṭai State. In this inscription Śrīvallabha is seen to have possessed another surname Avanipaśēkhara (அவனிபசேகர).

Periyāḷvār (பெரியாழ்வார்) alludes to his patron Śrīvallabha (ஸ்ரீவல்லப) *alias* Māṟaṇ (மாறன்) in the following passage :—

கொன்னவில் கூர்வேற்கோன் நெடுமாறன் தென்கூடற்கோன் தென்னன்கொண்டாடும் தென் திருமாலிருஞ் சோலையே.

Attention may also be drawn to the present tense கொண்டாடும் employed in the above passage. Śrīvallabha, the son of Varaguṇa (வரகுண), lived in the middle of the 9th century. The astronomical details regarding the age of Periyāḷvār (பெரியாழ்வார்) supplied by tradition yield A.D. 725 for the birth of Periyāḷvār; if he should be taken to be a contemporary of Śrīvallabha Pāṇḍya (ஸ்ரீவல்லப பாண்டிய) we should attribute to him an usually long life. We have therefore to reject the traditional date as it does not fit in with the other facts mentioned by the *Guruparamparās*. We must take only the middle of the 9th century as the approximate time at which Periyāḷvār flourished.

The next āḷvār, according to the tradition, was Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi (தொண்டரடிப்பொடி). He was the contemporary of Tirumaṅgaiyāḷvār (திருமங்கையாழ்வார்); between these is placed Tiruppāṇāḷvār (திருப்பாணாழ்வார்). So, if we fix the age of Tirumaṅgai (திருமங்கை), we would arrive at the age of the other two Āḷvārs also.

The following facts found in the works of Tirumaṅgai (திருமங்கை) afford us sufficient materials for the determination of the age of this Āḻvār:—

1. தென்னன் தொண்டையர்கோன் வணங்கும் நன்மயிலைத் திருவல்லிக்கேணி,
2. மன்னவன் தொண்டையர்கோன் வணங்கும் நீண்முடிமாலை வயிரமேகன் தன்வலி தன்புகழ் சூழ்ந்த கச்சியட்ட புயகரத்தாதி,
3. பல்லவன் மல்லையர்கோன் பணிந்த பரமேச்சுர விண்ணகரம்,
4. திரந்தவர் மண்ணையில் புண்ணுகர்வேல் நெடுவாயிலுகச் செருவில் முனநாள் பரந்தவன் பல்லவர்கோன்,
5. தென்னவனை முனையில் செருவில் திறல்வாட்டிய திண்சிலையோன் பார்மன்னு பல்லவர்கோன்,
6. உலகுடைமன்னன் தென்னவனைக் கன்னிமாமதிள் சூழ்கருவூர் வெருவபல படைசாய வென்றான்,
7. விடைதி நல்வில்லவன் நெல்மலியில் வெருவச் செருவேல் வலங்கைபிடித்த படைத்திறற் பல்லவர்கோன்,
8. கடல்போல் முழங்கும் குரற்கடுவாய் பறையுடைப் பல்லவர்கோன்,
9. தொல்புகழ் பல்லவர்கோன் and
10. செம்பியன் கோச்செங்கணான்.

Quotations 2 to 9 are from his decade in praise of the Viṣṇu in the temple of Parameccura-viṇṇagaram (பரமேச்சுரவிண்ணகரம்) at Kāñci. It has long been established that this temple was constructed by the Pallava king Parameśvaravarman (பரமேஸ்வரவர்மன்) II, the predecessor of Nandivarman Pallavamalla (நந்திவர்மன் பல்லவமல்ல). The walls of the *prākāra* of this temple contain a series of well-executed but ill-preserved panels of sculpture glorifying the Pallava race, by giving pictorial representations of the incidents in the lives of Parameśvaravarman (பரமேஸ்வரவர்மன்) and Nandivarman Pallavamalla (நந்திவர்மன் பல்லவமல்ல). From the short inscriptions engraved below these panels, we get glimpses as to how the last-named sovereign obtained sovereignty and how he was welcomed by the chief officers of the State and conducted into the capital. Students of South Indian History are familiar with the fact that Nandivarman Pallavamalla (நந்திவர்மன் பல்லவமல்ல) was harassed by dissensions caused by Citramāya (சித்திரமாய), a prince in the regular line, whom Pallavamalla superseded. The latter had for his confederates the Pāṇḍya king Parāntaka (பராந்தக) I, and other southern princes, whereas Pallavamalla was strongly supported by his subordinate chief Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyar (பெரும்பிடுகுமுத்தரையர்), his general Udayacandra and Adigaimān (அதிகைமான்). Nandivarman (நந்திவர்மன்) met his opponents in the battles of Śaṅkaramaṅgai (சங்கரமங்கை), Maṇṇaikkuḍi (மண்ணைக்குடி), Nelvēli (நெல்வேலி), Aḻindiyūr (அழிந்தியூர்) and Pugaḻiyūr (புகழியூர்). In the last of these places Adigaimāṉ (அதிகைமான்) was defeated by the Pāṇḍya Parāntaka (பாண்டிய பராந்தக).

The battles at Mannai (மண்ணை), Nelvēli (நெல்வேலி) and Karuvūr (கருவூர்), are referred to by Tirumangaiyāḷvār (திருமங்கையாழ்வார்). It is well known that the battles of Mannai (மண்ணை) and Nelvēli (நெல்வேலி) were fought by Nandivarman Pallavamalla (நந்தி வர்மன் பல்லவமல்ல). The Pāṇḍya king Parāntaka (பராந்தக) after defeating Adigaimāṉ (அதிகைமான்) at Pugaḷi (புகழி), which is the modern Pugalūr (புகளூர்) on the Trichinopoly-Erode branch of the South Indian Railway, appears to have proceeded to Karuvūr (கருவூர்), not far from Pugaḷiyūr (புகழியூர்). There he was confronted and defeated by Nandivarman Pallavamalla (நந்தி வர்மன் பல்லவமல்ல) as stated by Tirumangaiyāḷvār (திருமங்கை யாழ்வார்). Since the military achievements of the Pallavar-kōṉ (பல்லவர்கோன்) who, according to Tirumangai, worshipped the god in the temple of Parameccura-viṇṇagaram (பரமேச்சுரவிண்ணகரம்) and those of Nandivarman Pallavamalla are identical, there can possibly be no objection to our identifying the former with the latter.

The war-drum of Pallavamalla was called the *kaḍuvāypparai* (கடுவாய்ப்பறை) and it is described by Tirumangaiyāḷvār as sounding like the ocean in the following passage:—

கடல்போல் முழங்கும் குரற்கடுவாய்ப்பறையுடைப் பல்லவர்கோன்.

The name of this drum occurs in the Vakkalēri and the Kēndur grants of Kīrtivarman II of the Cālukya dynasty. The Tamil word *kaḍuvāypparai* (கடுவாய்ப்பறை) is therein most mechanically translated into *kaṭumukha-vāditra* (கடுமுகவாதித்திர). From the fact that—

प्रकृत्यमित्रस्य पल्लवस्य समूलोन्मूलनाय कृतमतिः त्वरया तुण्डाकविषयं प्राप्य अभिमुखागतन्नन्दिपोतवर्म्माभिधानं पल्लवं रणमुखे संप्रहृत्य प्रपालय्य कटुमुखवादित्रसमुद्रघोषाभिधानवाद्यविशेषौ . . हस्तेकृत्य ॥

Tirumangaiyāḷvār mentions the name of the drum of Pallavamalla, there could not be even a shadow of doubt that the Pallavar-kōṉ mentioned by the Āḷvār is the same as Nandivarman Pallavamalla and A.D. 717 to A.D. 779, which was the length of the reign of Pallavamalla, is the upper limit of the age of Tirumangai.

Let us now proceed with the determination of the lower limit for the age of Tirumangaiyāḷvār (திருமங்கையாழ்வார்). In his decade in praise of Viṣṇu at Aṭṭabuyakaram (அட்டபுயகரம்) at Kāñci, the Āḷvār makes mention of a Toṇḍaiyar-kōṉ Vairamēgaṉ (தொண்டையர்கோன் வைரமேகன்). Some scholars have identified this Toṇḍaiyarkōṉ (தொண்டையர்கோன்), that is, the Pallava Vairamēgha (வைரமேக) with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Dantidurga, who also bore the name Vairamēgha (வைரமேக). We know that the queen of Nandivarman Pallavamalla was a princess of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty and very likely the daughter of

Dantidurga. And it must be after him the son of Nandivarman Pallavamalla was named Dantivarman; he seems to have assumed also the surname Vairamēgha of his maternal grandfather. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa Danti was a bad king and was therefore deposed soon after his accession; there is therefore very little likelihood that that king took Kāñci and compelled its Pallava king to do homage to him. It is therefore unlikely that Tirumaṅgai had in his mind a foreign sovereign when he referred to Vairamēghan. On the other hand, we come across the name Vairamēghan *alias* Vāṇakōvaraiyaṉ (வாணகோவரையன்), in No. 158 of the Madras Epigraphist's Collection for 1912. The record is dated in the fourth year of the reign of the Pallava king Aparājitavarman (அபரா ஜிதவர்மன்), whom I have identified with Nṛpatuṅgavarman (நிருப துங்கன்), the last of the powerful Pallava kings of Kāñchi. The surname Vairamēgha of Dantivarman which is held as an *alias* by the subordinate Pāna (பாண) prince must, as usual, have been conferred on him by his sovereign who may have been Nṛpatuṅga himself or his father Nandivarman. Another inscription belonging to Uyyakkoṇḍār Tirumalai (உய்யக்கொண்டார் திருமலை) near Trichinopoly mentions a channel named Vairamēghan-kāl (வைரமேகன்கால்). In many places in the Trichinopoly district we come across the inscriptions of Dantivarman and in them we see him referred to by his name Dantivarman as also by his surnames such as Māṟppiḍugu (மாற்பிடுகு), etc. The channel referred to above may have been named after his surname Vairamēgha. Since the present tense வணங்கும் is employed by the Āḻvār in his reference to Vairamēgha, Tirumaṅgaiyāḻvār must have been a contemporary of Dantivarman. If this conclusion is correct, the age of Tirumaṅgai would fall in the first half of the 9th century, for, according to Prof. Jouveau Dubreuil Dantivarman lived from A.D. 779 to A.D. 830.

The ages of Tiruppāṇāḻvār (திருப்பாணாழ்வார்) and Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi (தொண்டரடிப்பொடி) must therefore also be fixed as the first half of the ninth century.

In the course of this lecture I have given one or two instances proving the acquaintance of the Āḻvārs with standard works such as the Tirukkuṟaḷ. The Āḻvārs were familiar with several other classic works. In the *Tirumālai* (திருமாலை) of Toṇḍaraḍippoḍiyāḻvār (தொண்டரடிப்பொடி), for instance, there occur two feet of a verse which are identical with two feet of another belonging to the work of the Saiva saint Apparsvāmigal (அப்பர்சுவாமிகள்). The verse in the *Tirumālai* (திருமாலை) runs thus :—

உள்ளத்தேயுறையுமாலை உள்ளுவா னுணர்வொன்றில்லா
கள்ளத்தேன் நானும் தொண்டாய்த் தொண்டுக்கே கோலம்பூண் [டேன்
உள்ளுவா ருள்கிற்றெல்லா முடனிருந்தறிதி யென்று
வெள்கிப்போ யென்னுள்ளே நான்விலாவறச் சிரித்திட்டேனே.

whereas that of the Tevaram of Apparsvāmigal thus :—

கள்ளனேன் கள்ளத்தொண்டாய்க் காலத்தைக் கழித்துப்போக்கித்
தெள்ளியேனாகி நின்று தேடினேன் நாடிக்கண்டேன்
உள்குவா ருள்கிற்றெல்லா முடனிருந் தறிதியென்று
வெள்கினேன் வெள்கிநாணும் விலாவறச் சிரித்திட்டேனே.

Since we know that Apparsvāmigal (அப்பர்சுவாமிகள்) lived in the middle of the seventh century and the Toṇḍaradippoḍi (தொண்டரடிப்பொடி) in the middle of the ninth century, we are obliged to remark that the latter must have borrowed both the thought and the language of the former.

Even in the time of the Śaiva devotee there must have been some amount of Vaishṇava awakening which the Śaiva saint views with dislike. He says

தாயினு நல்ல சங்கரனுக்கன்ப
ராயவுள்ளத் தமுதருந்தப்பெறார் பேயர்,
பேய்முலை யுண்டுயிர் போக்கிய
மாயன் மாயத்துப் பட்டமனத்தரே.

Again, Tirumaṅgaiyāḻvār refers to a custom of the ancient Tamil land and which is described in the *Tolkāppiyam* (தொல்காப்பியம்) and the *Tirukkuṟaḷ* (திருக்குறள்). The custom is known as (மடலேறுதல்). The *Tolkāppiyam* distinctly prohibits the practice of this custom in the case of women in the following sutra :—

எத்திணை மருங்கினு மகடூஉ மடன்மேற்
பொற்புடை நெறிமை யின்மையான.

and gives the following examples in illustration of it,

கடலன்ன காமத்தராயினும் பெண்டிர்
மடலூரார் மைந்தர் மேலென்ப—மடலூர்தல்
காட்டுகேன் வம்மின் கலிவஞ்சியார் கோமான்
வேட்டமா மேற்கொண்ட போழ்து

and the *Kuṟaḷ*

கடலன்னகாம முழந்து மடலேறாப்
பெண்ணிற் பெருந்தக்கதில்.

In his *Periya-Tirumaḍal* (பெரியதிருமடல்), Tirumaṅgaiyār notes that the Tamil grammars do not countenance women practising the custom of *maḍal-ēṟudal* and defies the Tamil grammars and expresses his opinion that the limitations put upon females by the grammars are unjustifiable in the following passage :—

அன்னநடையா ரலரேச ஆடவர்மேல்மானேக்கின்
மன்னுமடலூரா ரென்பதோர் வாசகமும்
தென்னுரையில் கேட்டறிவதுண்டு—அதனையாம் தெறியேம்,

It is plain therefore that Tirumaṅgaiyār was familiar with *Tolkāppiyam* and other classic works.

The later Āḷvārs seem to be acquainted with each other's work, as is evidenced by the innumerable parallel passages which might easily be quoted. I shall give here a few examples:—

மானமருமென்னோக்கி வைதேவீ விண்ணப்பம்

Periyāḷvār.

மானமருமென்னோக்கி வைதேவீ யின்துணையா
கானமரும் கல்லதர்போய் காடுறைந்தான் காணேடீ

Tirumaṅgai.

கரும்பினைக்கண்டு கொண்டென் கண்ணிணை களிக்குமாறே

Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi.

கண்டுகொண்டேன் கண்ணிணையாரக் களித்து
மலையெடுத்துக் கல்மாரி காத்து

Nammāḷvār.

கல்லெடுத்துக் கல்மாரி காத்தாயென்றும்

Tirumangai.

ஆவியே யாரமுதே என்னையாளுடைத்
தூவியம் புள்ளுடையாய்

Nammāḷvār.

ஆவியே யமுதேயென நினைந்துருகி

Tirumaṅgai.

மெய்யனாகும் விரும்பித் தொழுவார்க்கெல்லாம்
பொய்யனாகும் புறமேதொழுவார்க்கெல்லாம்

Nammāḷvār,

மெய்யர்க்கே மெய்யனாகும் விதியிலா வென்னைப்போல
பொய்யர்க்கே பொய்யனாகும் புட்கொடியுடைய கோமான்.

Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi.

சுரும்பமர் சோலைசூழ்ந்த வரங்கமா கோயில்கொண்ட
கரும்பினைக் கண்டுகொண்டென் கண்ணிணை களிக்குமாறே.
திருக்குறுந் தாண்டகம்.

Tirumaṅgai.

சுரும்பமர் சோலைசூழ்ந்த வரங்கமா கோயில்கொண்ட
கரும்பினைக் கண்டுகொண்டென் கண்ணிணை களிக்குமாறே

Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi.

கன்னிநன் மாமதிள்சூழ்தரும் பொழிற்காவிரித் தென்னரங்கம்

Periyāḷvar.

கன்னிநன மாமதிள்புடைசூழ் கணபுரத்தென் கருமணியே.

Kulaśēkhara.

From the way in which Kulaśēkhara qualifies the word *Toṇḍar* in the following passage, he seems to have had the name Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi in his mind or we may take that Toṇḍaraḍippoḍiyāḷvār (தொண்டரடிப்பொடியாழ்வார்) got the suggestion to name himself Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi from the works of Kulaśēkhara.

ஆடிப்பாடி அரங்கவோ என்றழைக்கும் தொண்டரடிப்பொடி
ஆடநாம் பெறில் கங்கைநீர் குடைந்தாடும் வேட்கை யென்னாவதே.

The works of the Āḷvārs may be described as welling with a genuine love of an extremely intense degree for Viṣṇu and in their earnestness and fervour they stand only on a par with the equally strong and touching appeals to God made in their *Tēvāram* (தேவாரம்) by the Śaiva saints. This love, or *bhakti*, is the foundation for the doctrine of *prapatti* (பிரபத்தி) which looms large in the Śrīvaiṣṇava philosophy. Even the hardest heart cannot resist the extremely pathetic and beautifully poetic appeals of a Kulaśēkhara, an Āṇḍāḷ or a Tiruppāṇāḷvār. The compositions of the Āḷvārs do indeed deserve the encomiums

சங்கத்தமிழ்மாலை, சங்கமுத்தமிழ், தமிழ்நூற் புலவன்

occurring in their own works, as also those lavishly bestowed on them by later authors. To deal adequately with the merits of their works does not fall within the scope of the present lecture and with your permission, I pass over it.

THE ĀCĀRYAS.

The Śrīvaiṣṇava chroniclers make justly a distinction between the Āḷvārs and the Acāryas, the former being saints who had realized Brahman and had personal enjoyment of His grace, whereas the latter were learned propounders and elaboraters of the philosophy contained in the works of the Āḷvārs and were certainly far lower than the Āḷvārs. The first of the Ācāryas was Nāthamunigaḷ. In fixing the age of Nāthamunigaḷ there are several difficulties, the data being of a very conflicting nature. The earliest of the *Guruparamparās*, the *Divyasūri-carita* distinctly states that Nāthamuni obtained directly from Śaṭhakōpa, through the influence of Madhurakavi, his own works.

The *Guruparamparā* of Piṇbaḷakiyaperumāḷ Jīyar (பின்பழகிய பெருமாள் ஜீயர்) however, affirms that Nāthamuni (நாதமுனி) secured the works of Nammāḷvār and other Āḷvārs in a dream from the former, who became pleased with Nāthamuni after he repeated 12,000 times certain verses as advised by Parāṅkuśadāsa, a disciple of Madhurakavi. This statement, namely, that Nāthamuni obtained the *divya-prabandhas* of all the Āḷvārs from Nammāḷvār in a dream is repeated in all subsequent *Guruparamparās*.

Later on the Śrīvaiṣṇavas finding that the attribution of a great antiquity to the Āḷvārs removed them far into the past and that it created a long gap of time between the Āḷvārs and the Ācāryas, and with a desire to bridge over it, contrived to give a long line of disciples to Madhurakavi and asserted that Parāṅkuśadāsa (பராங்குசதாச) was but one of this lineage. They also contended that the older *Guruparamparās* ought not to be understood as stating

that Parāṅkuśadāsa was the immediate disciple of Madhurakavi, but that he must be presumed to be a remote descendant in the line of disciples of Madhurakavi. They also lengthened the life of Nāthamuni to 330 or 340 years. If we realize that Nammāḷvār lived in the ninth century and that Madhurakavi or his disciple Parāṅkuśadāsa lived even after Nammāḷvār, we cannot find enough time in the interval between the end of the life of Parāṅkuśadāsa and the beginning of that of Rāmānuja, that is, between about A.D. 900 and 1017 to interpose 340 years for the life of Nāthamuni and 120 years for that of Āḷavandār. It is very probable that Nāthamunigaḷ flourished in the last quarter of the ninth and the major portion of the tenth century. A supposition such as this makes it not impossible for him to have directly met Madhurakavi or his disciple Parāṅkuśadāsa and obtained the *Tiruvāymoḷi* from either.

An important document was recently discovered by me which throws considerable light upon the history of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas. It is a set of copper-plates dug out of the earth in the village of Aṇbil (அன்பில்), not far from Śrīraṅgam; it belongs to the reign of the Cōḷa king Parāntaka II otherwise known also as Sundaracōḷa. It records a grant of land which the king made to a Brāhmaṇa officer of his, who was a native of Aṇbil. This officer and four ancestors of his were great devotees of the God Raṅganātha of Śrīraṅgam and their donations to the temple are detailed in the document. The author of the beautiful Sanskrit verses which form the first portion is stated therein to be a disciple of Śrīnātha. Since the date of the inscription falls in the middle of the tenth century, we may reasonably identify this Śrīnātha with the Ācarya Nāthamunigaḷ. The first of the four ancestors of the donee must then have lived in the ninth century and must therefore have come under the influence of the Āḷvārs who were congregated in the temple of Raṅganātha in Śrīraṅgam, situated very near his own village of Aṇbil.

Regarding Nāthamuni there occur in the *Guruparamparās* certain facts of apparently historical value, namely, that he was born in the *agrahāra* of Vīranārāyaṇapuram (வீரநாராயணபுரம்) and died in Gaṅgaikoṇḍaśōḷapuram (கங்கைகொண்டசோழபுரம்). Though it is perfectly possible that Nāthamunigaḷ lived in the *agrahāra* of Vīranārāyaṇapuram, it does not seem to be possible that he died in Gaṅgaikoṇḍaśōḷapuram. This latter place could not have come into existence at the time of Nāthamunigaḷ. For, Rājēndracōḷa (ராஜேந்திரசோழ), who is well-known also as Gaṅgaikoṇḍaśōḷa, began to reign in A.D. 1012 and he did not proceed on his northern expedition before the 12th year of his reign. It was only after he had extended his conquest as far as the Ganges that he obtained the surname Gaṅgaikoṇḍaśōḷa. If the newly raised city went by the name of Gaṅgaikoṇḍaśōḷapuram, this

could have been only after A.D. 1024. If it be a fact that Nāthamunigaḷ actually died in Gaṅgaikoṇḍaśōḷapuram, the event should have occurred after A.D. 1024 at the earliest. Āḷavandār (ஆளவந்தார்), the grandson of Nāthamunigaḷ (நாதமுனிகள்), is known to have been born some time after the death of Nāthamunigaḷ; he must then have been born after 1024. But Rāmānuja, his disciple and who was very much younger than he, is stated to have been born in the year A.D. 1017. This leads us to the absurd conclusion that the Ācarya of Rāmānuja was born after him. The name Gaṅgaikoṇḍasōḷapuram led first myself and then, the writers on Śrīvaiṣṇava history who came after me, into awkward mistakes. The name of the place where Nāthamunigaḷ died must have been identified by later hagiologists with the then prominent city of Gaṅgaikoṇḍaśōḷapuram. On the other hand if we assume that Nāthamunigaḷ lived in the reign of Parāntakacōḷa I at Vīranārāyaṇapuram and died before or in the reign of Parāntakachōḷa II, he must have lived for over 80 or 90 years.

If now we assume that Nāthamunigaḷ died in the middle of the tenth century, the life of Āḷavandār must have begun at the same period and extended into the first half of the eleventh century. Tradition gives astronomical data for the birth of Āḷavandār which fix that event at A.D. 918. Similarly, his death is believed to have taken place in 1038. It is not impossible that a man lived for 120 years, especially in those olden times when people were much hardier than they are at the present time, but it appears to be improbable in the case of Āḷavandār.

It is a fact that a person becomes prominent in the world only after he attains a high position in society; every action of his is then watched and every word of his listened to with eagerness by the multitude of his admirers, who begin to note carefully the events in the subsequent life of their hero. They may thus manage to get all the information of his later life though the earlier portion may be lost in obscurity. This must be so especially in the case of a Hindu *sanyāsin*, who cannot be questioned about his *pūrvāśrama*, which he is supposed not to remember. For, his civil existence ends when he assumes the garb of the *sanyāsin*. If it is difficult to obtain information of the early life of a *sanyāsin* even in his life-time, it must necessarily become much more so for a person of a succeeding generation desirous of compiling a biography of a deceased worthy. The paucity of information regarding the earlier portion of the life of Rāmānuja had indeed confronted the Śrīvaiṣṇava chroniclers, and it is here that the modern investigators also experience great difficulties. While we find the dates for all important events in the later life of Rāmānuja, we possess no such definite data concerning his life before he left for the Hoysaḷa kingdom. All that we are able to gather from the *Guruparamparās* is that his father imparted to his son elementary

education and died when his son was still young.* The sisters of Rāmānuja, being already married, had joined their husbands. Rāmānuja was not encumbered with any superfluity of worldly goods and therefore had little difficulty in leaving his birthplace and settling down at Kāñci.

In India where the orthodox system of imparting religious instruction had not in the least changed from ages long past, a fair knowledge of grammar and logic (not to say a certain proficiency in the Sanskṛit language), was considered absolutely necessary for beginning the study of philosophy. Such an initial study would account for the life of a student up to at least the 16th year of age.

After receiving his elementary education from his father, Rāmānuja left his home, we will say at about the age of 16, to prosecute his higher studies under the Vēdāntic teacher Yādavaprakāśa who was then lecturing at Conjeeveram. He continued under the tuition of Yādavaprakāśa for some time before differences of opinion arose between the teacher and the pupil. The events narrated in this period of Rāmānuja's life require us to allot about four years at least, for his discipleship under Yādavaprakāśa. Rāmānuja must first have had a fair training in Vēdānta. Then alone he could possibly have balanced in his mind the interpretations put on the texts by his preceptor with the conflicting ones that suggested themselves to him. Then there came the pilgrimage to Benares when all his disciples are said to have accompanied Yādavaprakāśa. It was in the middle of this pilgrimage that Rāmānuja left his preceptor and returned home to Kāñci. It is thus clear that the estimate of four years is very just and proper.

After thus breaking off from his preceptor, Rāmānuja settled down as a householder at Kāñci with his mother and wife(1) and

---

* गर्भाष्टमे शुभदिने केशवार्यो महायशाः ।
वेदान् सलक्षणांस्तस्य स्वयमेवोपदिश्य च ॥
विद्यास्नातस्य पुत्रस्य विवाहं कर्तुमुद्यतः ।
ततस्तु षोडशे वर्षे पुत्रस्यादित्यवर्चसः ॥
विवाहं विधिना चक्रे स विप्रो वेदपारगः ।
ततः स केशवो यज्वा कालेन महता तदा ॥
जगाम वैष्णवं लोकं नित्यमुक्तैस्समावृतम् ।

(1) From the mention of his mother and wife alone, we are led to infer that his father was not alive then. This inference receives ample corroboration from the statement of the *Guruparamparās* that Rāmā·uja consulted his mother as to what he should do for his further religious studies after disconnecting himself from Yādavaprakāśa. It is clear he would not have acted thus if his father were alive. Again, the fact that he unceremoniously established himself at Kāñci in preference to his ancestral village Śrīperumbūdūr surely warrants the conclusion that he had no proprietary interest in the latter.

continued his studies at home. Rāmānuja remained thus, till he was summoned by Āḷavandār who wanted to make him his successor. He left Kāñci accompanied by Tiruvarangapperumāḷaraiyar who had been sent by Āḷavandār, and reached Śrīrangam, as we have already said, only to hear of the demise of him who would have been his teacher. When he went to Śrīrangam to visit Āḷavandār he may have been 25 or 27 years old. I may, in passing, again refer to the fact that Rāmānuja returned to Kāñci immediately and continued there for about five years.

Rāmānuja apparently took holy orders in his 30th or 32nd year of age. For, immediately after this event, his nephew Mudaliyāṇḍān (*alias* Dāśarathi), and Kūrattāḻvāṉ (*alias* Śrīvatsāṅka-miśra) joined him to begin their study of the Vēdānta. Applying the same reasoning as in the case of Rāmānuja, these young men must then have been about 16 years of age.(1)

From this also we see that Rāmānuja must have been more or less about 32 years old at the time when these pupils joined him.

After taking holy orders, Rāmānuja removed himself to Śrīrangam, where he is reported to have effected many reforms in the Ranganātha temple and created several offices for the better management of its affairs. It is clear that, great as Rāmānuja was, he could not have induced the hereditary managers of the temple to relinquish all their rights in his favour all at once. Hence we may fairly assume that it took him several years to introduce the various reforms.

Having thus placed the affairs of the temple on a firm basis, Rāmānuja started on his extensive tours of pilgrimage. He had another object in thus setting out, *viz.*, that of collecting books and materials for his great work, the Śrī Bhāṣyam. The places actually

---

(1) The date of the birth of Mudaliyāṇḍāṉ is given in the following verse:—

स्वर्गीयाभशरद्गतौ कलियुगे संवत्सरे श्रीमुखे
चैत्रे मासि सितद्युतावुपचितावष्टादशे चाहनि ।
षष्ठ्यामिन्दुदिने रघुप्रवरभे वाधूलवंश्याग्रणीः
जज्ञे दाशरथिर्हि यस्य महितो रामानुजो मातुलः ॥

and the date of the birth of Kūrattāḻvāṉ, in the following sloka:—

कल्यब्दे कलिपावने मकरगे सूर्ये च शुक्लोत्तरे
वर्षे भानुतदीयवासरवरे पक्षे च शुक्लोत्तमे ।
पञ्चम्यां करिशैलनेतुरनघे नक्षत्रवर्ये च यः
श्रीवत्साङ्कसुधीरवातरदसौ भूलोकपुण्योदयः ॥

visited by him are enumerated in a foot note.(1) After finishing his tours, he again settled down at Śrīraṅgam for the purpose of writing his *chef d'oeuvre*, the Śrī Bhāṣyam, in which task Kūrattāḷvāṉ proved of immense help. Two-thirds of the work had been finished when the Cōḷa persecution began and it was completed, according to the *Rāmānujārya divyacaritam*, in 1077 Śaka, A.D. 1155(2). That 1077 is a mistake for 1047 Śaka (= A.D. 1125) will appear from the following facts. According to the chronogram '*Dharmōnaṣṭaḥ,*' Rāmānuja died in 1059 Śaka (A.D. 1137) and to say that the work was completed in 1077 Śaka (A.D. 1155) is absurd. When the work had advanced about two-thirds of its length, Rāmānuja was obliged to seek refuge in the Hoysaḷa country from Cōḷa persecution.

The date of the Cōḷa persecution is indirectly obtained thus: Periyanambi accompanied Kūrattāḷvāṉ to the Cōḷa court and there his eyes and those of Kūrattāḷvāṉ were put out. The old Periyanambi, not being able to bear the effects of the blinding, died on his way home. This event is stated to have taken place in the year Kālayukti.

कालयुक्त्यष्टकामध्यातिथिः प्रोक्ता महागुरोः ।
यामुनार्यपदाम्भोजशुश्रूषा याभवत्सदा ॥ *Rām. Div., p.* 216.

The year *Kāḷayukti* was one falling within the reign of Kulōttuṅga I, who, later on, will be shown to have been the persecutor of Rāmānuja. In fact there occurs a Kāḷayukti year in this reign which corresponds to A.D. 1078-79. Since the death of Periyanambi occurred shortly after his visit to the Cōḷa capital, we may take A.D. 1078-79 to be the year when Rāmānuja and his followers were persecuted by the Cōḷa king.

And it was only on hearing of the demise of his persecutor after 1039 Śaka (A.D. 1117), that he returned to Śrīraṅgam and was joined by his pupil Kūrattāḷvāṉ. Then, according to the *Rāmānujārya Divya Caritam*, Rāmānuja finished the Śrī Bhāshyam. Thus it is extremely likely that the date of the completion of the work was 1047 Śaka (A.D. 1125). This conclusion receives ample

---

(1) Kāñci, Tirukkōvalūr, Tirupatı, Tirupputkuḻi, Kumbhakōṇam, Aḻagarkōil, Tiruppullāṇi, Āḻvār-Tirunagari, Tirukkuṟuṅguḍi, Tiruvaṇpariśāram, Tiruvaṭṭār, Tiruvaṉandapuram, Tiruvallikkeṇi, Tirunīrmalai, Madhurāntakam, Tiruvayindirapuram. Rāmānuja is also reported to have visited all the *Tiruppadi's* of Northern India also.

(2) இன்னவாறு திருப்பதிகளெங்கும் வாழ்வித் தெதிராஜன்
தன்னதாக்கித் தரிசனமும் தரணியெங்கும் விளங்குவித்து
முன்னமுறைத்த பாடியத்தின் முற்றமூன்றத் தொறுகூறு
தன்னைச்சென்றுண்டாயிரத் தாங்கெழுபத்தேழில் சாத்தினன்.

Rāmānujārya-Divyacaritai, p. 243.

corroboration from an unexpected quarter. In the Madhva work called the *Chalāri-Smṛiti* there occurs this *Ślōka*:

कलौ प्रवृत्तबौद्धादिमतं रामानुजं तथा ।
शके ह्येकोनपञ्चाशदधिकाब्दे सहस्रके ॥
निराकर्तुं मुख्यवायुः सन्मतस्थापनाय च ।
एकादशशते शाके विंशत्यष्टयुगे गते ॥
अवतीर्णं मध्वगुरुं सदा वन्दे महागुणम् ।

according to which Rāmānuja's system in 1049 Śaka (A.D. 1127) was already an established fact, recognized as giving rise to a new school of philosophy. Therefore 1047 Śaka (A.D. 1125) is the proper and correct date.

In 1021 Śaka (A.D. 1099) Bahudhānya, Rāmānuja was already at Toṇḍaṇūr.(1) For, in this year he had completed the construction, with the help of Viṣṇuvardhana of the Tirunārāyaṇapperumāḷ temple at Mēlukōṭe. This fact shows the great influence Rāmānuja must have exerted in his new surroundings. Escaping the Cōḷa persecution, he settled at Toṇḍaṇūr and not long after, was able to effect the conversion of no less a person than the Jaina king of the Hoysaḷa country, Biṭṭidēva, whom he re-named Vishṇuvardhanadēva (or-rāya). With the help of his royal convert he constructed a large lake near Toṇḍaṇūr and called it Tirumalai-Sāgara.(2)

The conversion of the Hoysaḷa king must therefore have taken place sometime before 1021 Śaka (A.D. 1099). Mr. Rice asserts that it must have been effected in A.D. 1117 (i.e., 1039 Śaka).(3) He seems to proceed upon a record of the Bēlūr temple which is a genuine Vaiṣṇava one. Possibly also the following passage from the Sthalapurāṇa of Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa induced him to confirm his

(1) The *Guruparampară-prabhāvam* and the *Rāmānujārya Divya Caritam* and all other Teṅgalai versions of the story have 1012 Śaka, coupled with Bahudhānya. Bahudhānya tallies with 1021 Śaka, and not with 1012 Śaka. The Vaḍagalai Sampradāyam gives the date correctly: the astronomical details do not work up correctly.

(2) This beautiful lake was named Mōti-talab (lake of pearls) for its clearness of water, by Nāzīr-jung, son of the Subadār of Deccan, who visited it in A.D. 1746. The Yādavanadi feeds the tank.

(3) In the *Mysore Gazetteer*, Volume I, says Mr. Rice:—

"The step (conversion to Vaiṣṇavaism of Biṭidēva) accompanied by a change of his name to Viṣṇuvardhana, by which he is principally known, was probably taken in about A.D. 1117"

Some of the inscriptions of Biṭṭidēva dated before Saka 1039 (A.D. 1117), call him Vishṇuvardhana. Compare *Epigraphia Carnatica*.

No. 6, Yaḍatore (Saka 1038)
No. 83, Chāmarājaṇagara (Śaka 1039).
No. 34, Arsikeer (Śaka 1023).
No. 149, Hussan (Śaka 1035?).
No. 89, Shimoga (Cālukya Vikrama era 35 1034–5 Saka).
No. 164, Kadur (Chapter 25, 1024–5 Saka).

In this, he is simply called Biṭṭidēva.

conclusion. The Sthalapurāṇa says, "In Śaka year 1039, Durmukhi, Beṭṭavardhana, under the taunts of his favourite concubine and the arguments of Rāmānujācarya, received '*Taptamudrā*' (mark of religion) and thus became a convert to the Vaiṣṇava religion. He then changed his name to Viṣṇuvardhana, and with a bitter hatred against this (Jaina) religion, discontinued or abolished all the *ināms*, destroyed 790 Basti temples, and set up Pañca Nārāyaṇas, viz., Chennige-Nārāyaṇa at Bēlūra, Kīrti-Nārāyaṇa at Talakāḍu,[1] Vijaya-Nārāyana at Gadugu, and Lakshmī Nārāyaṇa at Haradanahaḷḷi, transferring to these all the *svastiyas* or ināms that had formerly been given to the Basti temples. He built the tank at Toṇḍamiru (Toṇḍanuru?) from the stones of the destroyed Basti temples and called it Tirumalasāgara. Having abolished different kinds of Jaina ināms, he established below this tank Tirumalasāgara-cattra for the feeding of the Rāmānuja Kūṭa. He gave the name of Mēlukōṭe and Tirunārāyaṇapuram to the village of Doḍḍaguruganahaḷḷi, constructed several temples and places and caused steps to be erected to the hill of Mēlukōṭe.[2]" It carries the story to the reign of Krishṇarāja Oḍayār and mentions the *Mahābhisēka* performed by him to the colossal image of Gommaṭēśvara. This shows that it was compiled very recently from available information of a hearsay nature and hence is quite unfit for historical purposes. Therefore the inference of Mr. Rice is untenable and it must be presumed that Rāmānuja effected the royal conversion sometime before 1021 Śaka (A.D. 1099).

After building the Tirunārāyaṇa temple on the Yādavādri (Mēlukōte), Rāmānuja lived in this new village for a period of nearly 12 years.[3] At the end of this period Rāmānuja sent his

---

(1) There seems to be some truth in this statement. At least as regards Talakāḍ there is no doubt. I have myself seen a Jaina idol (perhaps the original occupant of the temple), be-*nāmamed* and oiled, in the *prākāra* of the temple. The niches in the *Vimāna* are extended with brick in chunam to accommodate Brāhman Gods covering up the old Jaina images already set up in them.

(2) *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. II, May 1873.

(3) The Śrī Vaiṣṇavas assert that his whole stay in the West was only for 12 years. It is wrong. For, if they believe that he was in Toṇḍanūr in 1021 Śaka and returned to Srīrangam after the setting up of the Pañca-Nārāyaṇas of which one took place in 1039 Śaka according to the Bēlūr inscription, he must have lived in Toṇḍanūr and Mēlukōte for not less than 20 years. This long stay in these parts left its powerful influence and we see as an effect thereof, a number of Viṣṇu temples springing up. One was built in Toṇḍanūr itself in the reign of Narasiṁha (son of Vishṇuvardhana). In the year 1080 Śaka (A.D. 1158)—here Mr. Rice's reading Śaka 1030 is wrong as Vishnuvardhana was still reigning then—a Sarvādhikārí Sēanpati Kārikkuḍi Tillaikküttāṇḍi-daṇḍanāyakan, son of Ulagamuṇḍān, constructed in the middle of Yādava-Nārāyaṇa-Chaturvēdi-mangalam (Toṇḍanūr itself), the temple of Kārikkuḍi-Tillaikkūtta-Viṇṇagaram and set up Viṟ-ṟirunda Perumāḷ, Lakshmī and Bhūmī and made grants to the temple. It is at present known as Krishṇadēva's temple. The king himself made some grants of land in Śaka 1082 (here Mr. Rice's reading is 1062 Śaka) for the same temple for some offerings.

nephew Mudaliyāṇḍāṉ to Bēlūr, the then Hoysaḷa capital (perhaps at the request of the King) to set up the Pañcha Nārāyaṇas.[1] At Bēlūr, Vijaya-Nārāyaṇa's image was set up in 1039 Śaka (A.D. 1117). The passage referring to this event in the rather long and beautiful *Śāsana* of Bēlūr runs as follows :—

* * * *

"Param-Brahma-svarūpanum Enipa Śrīmad-Vijaya-Nārāyaṇa dēvaram Śrīmad-Vishṇuvarddhana-Poysaḷa-Dēvar ssadbhaktiyim su-pratishṭhitam-māḍi Śaka Varsha Sāśirada-mūvattombhattenēya Hēmalambi-Saṁvatsarada Chaitra-Śuddha-Pañchami-Ādi-vāra Śrī-Vijaya-Nārāyaṇa-Dēvara Śrī-Chennakēśava-Dēvara Śrī-Lakshmī-Nārāyaṇa-Dēvara nitya-naimittika divyāṅgabhōga tri-kāla-nivēdya Śrī-Vaishṇavara brāhmaṇara mantra-gītapātra-pāguḍa samasta-ūḷigada Jīvita-varggakkavāgi sarvvanamasya samasta-kirukula-dēvi-dēvana Kāṇike sahita Śrī-pādadalli dhāra-pūrvvakam māḍida vṛitti, etc., etc.[2]"

In 1911–12, Rao Bahadur Mr. R. Narasiṁhāchārya discovered at Talakāḍ an inscription on the base of the temple of Kīrtinārāyaṇa, one of the five Nārāyaṇa images set up by Mudaliyāṇḍāṉ at the instance of Vishṇuvardhana, which reads thus :—

விஷ்ணுவர்த்தந பொய்சள தேவர் ஹேமலம்பி ஸம்வத்ஸரத்து
மார்கழிமாசத்து பூர்வபக்ஷத்து வெள்ளிக்கிழமையும் த்ரயோதசியும் பெற்ற
விசா [க*] த்து நாள் அதியமானை நிர்மூலித்துத் தழைக்காடுகொண்டு ஸ்ரீ கீர்
த்தி நாராயணப் பெருமானை திருப்பிரதிஷ்டைபண்ணி . . .

The installation of Kīrtinārāyaṇa image took place nearly three months earlier than that of Vijayanārāyaṇa at Bēlūr.

The above records give us the dates of Mudaliyāṇḍāṉ's visit to Bēlūr and Talakāḍ. Even then Rāmānuja continued to live at Mēlukōṭe and had not returned to Śrīraṅgam.

About this time, news was brought to Rāmānuja by Māroṉṟillā-Māruti-Śiṟiyāṇḍāṉ (one of his disciples) of the death of the persecuting Cōḷa king at Gaṅgaikoṇḍa-Cōḷapuram. The only Cōḷa king who is known to have died about 1039 Śaka (A.D. 1117) is Rājakēsarivarman Kulōttuṅga I. Hence, Kulōttuṅga I has to be

---

(1) விஞ்சுபுகழாண்டானை வேலூர் செலவிடுத்தருளிப்
பஞ்சநாரணனை பிரதிட்டைபண்ணி நாரணப்பதியில்
அஞ்சலென்று தன்னடிமையாகு மைம்பத்திருவர்தமைக்
கஞ்சமலராள் நாயகனை காத்திருமென்று கழறு

Rāmānujārya-Divya Caritam, page 218

श्रीरामांशसमाविष्टं पाञ्चजन्यांशसम्भवम् ।
पञ्चनारायणस्थानस्थापकं गुरुमाश्रये ॥

(2) *Ep. Carn.*, Hassan-Belur, No. 71, page 137.

identified with the persecutor of Rāmānuja; he was known to Śrī Vaiṣṇavas as Kṛmikaṇṭha Chōḷa, Karikāla, etc. That this identification is conclusive is borne out by the fact that Rāmānuja had heard in 1009 Śaka (A.D. 1087) that "Śeṉṉi Kulōttuṅga" (*Rāmānujārya Divya Caritam*, page 236)[1] had destroyed the Viṣṇu temple at Citrakūṭam (Chidambaram). That Kulōttuṅga was otherwise known by the name of Karikāla is testified by the *Kaliṅgattupparaṇi*. The stanza which calls him by that name runs thus:—

பூப்பது மத்தவன் படைத்தமைத்த
புவியை யிரண்டாவதும் படைத்துப்
காப்பது மென்கடனென்று காத்த
கரிகாலச் சோழனை வாழ்த்தினவே.

In some of his inscriptions, Viṣṇuvardhana refers to his Cōḷa adversary by the name of Rājēndrachōḷa.[2] This, we have already noted, was the earlier name of Kulōttuṅga I.

In the Koḷattūr plates published in *Ep. Carn.*, Mysore, Vol. I, No. 94, Tirumukudlu-Narasipur Taluk, Rājēndra Cōla (Kulōttuṅga's original name) is called also Karikāla.

Those scholars who have written before me on Rāmānuja uniformly failed to identify the Cōḷa persecutor of the Vaiṣṇava teacher. I trust the reasons mentioned by me make the identification fairly conclusive.

There now arises a difficulty, though only an apparent one, if we should accept the foregoing conclusion. It is this. Epigraphy has never given us any cause to suppose that Kulōttuṅga I had any fanatic Śaiva tendencies or that he ever made himself a persecuting or an unpopular monarch. On the other hand he is characterised as a very tolerant man making grants to Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava and Jaina temples alike, trying always to win the goodwill of the people by encouraging arts and literature, endowing many villages with well-built temples, to many of which he lent his name; in fact he was the type of a good monarch. How then could such a person be accused of having been the persecutor of Rāmānuja? Such a persecution would have been a serious

---

(1) அம்பொற் குடைச்சகணையிரத்
தொன்பதாம் வருஷத்துத் தென்
பால்சென்னி குலோத்துங்கன்
சித்திரகூடச் செங்கண்மால்
தன்னை அலையெறி நாள்தான். . . .

(2) No. 58, Bēlūr, No. 147, Bēlūr.
Ele kāvēriya vāri kūḍe polas ādattendu pēvaisutam
Keladoḷ kūpa-jalāsiy appinegam ā-Rājēndrachōḷam bhuja
Baladim Vishṇu tadīyasēnēya peṇaṅgaḷ tan-nadi-pūradoḷ
Kaḷasal Vikrama-kēḷiyam meṛadan atyugra-pratā-pōdayam.
Ep. Carn., Hassan District.

political blunder, seeing especially that he was only an usurper of the Cōḷa throne: it would have stirred to a rebellion the multitudinous followers of Rāmānuja. This is certainly a weighty question and I shall now try to give an explanation.

In the traditional account it is stated that the king summoned Rāmānuja to his court to discuss religious matters. Apprehending danger to his master from the Cōḷa king, Kūrattāḷvāṉ, the foremost and most loyal follower of Rāmānuja, put on the Sanyāsin's garb and impersonated his teacher in the king's presence. Of course the king mistook him for the real Vaiṣṇava reformer. On being questioned if he had any objections to subscribe to the faith that "There was none superior to Śiva," he replied impertinently that *Drōṇa* was bigger than *Śiva*, playing upon the words *Śiva* and *Drōṇa** —two measures, of which the *Drōṇa* was the bigger. This reply was quite unsuited to the time and place and the joke which might have elsewhere elicited a mere laugh stirred up the wrath of the king, who ordered that the eyes of the impertinent man should be put out forthwith. The order was of course readily executed. Ever since this incident, the Cōḷa king hated Rāmānuja worse than ever, being apparently still under the mistaken belief that the impertinent disciple was the real Rāmānuja.

That the king hated only Rāmānuja and not Śrī-Vaishṇavaism in general, is amply proved by the statements in the *Guruparamparā*, that many of its votaries were living in the capital of the Cōḷa king unmolested. In many inscriptions found in Vaiṣṇava temples such as the one at Mannārguḍi (which by the way is there known as Kulōttuṅga-Cōḷa-Viṇṇagaram), Śrīraṅgam, Tiruvēndipuram, etc., he figures prominently as a donor to these temples. Hence we may be sure that the hatred of the king was personal and not sectarian.

That this king destroyed the Viṣṇu temple at Chidambaram is not a matter for surprise. Most probably, like the modern Nāṭṭukkōṭṭai Cheṭṭies, he desired to have the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava temples located in separate compounds. And this act would not prove him to have been actuated by any hatred towards Vaiṣṇavaism.

But that the king was a Śaiva by faith is abundantly proved by various facts. Prominent among them is that one of his surnames was "Tirunīṟṟuc-cōḻaṉ." He covered the shrine at Chidambaram called the "Pērambalam" with gold. He induced Sēkkiḻār to write the "*Periyapurāṇam*" and made, under the name of Anapāya-Cōḷa, extensive grants to the images of Tirujñānasambandha, Vāgīśa and Sundaramūrti in the Tiruvārūr temple.

---

* शिवात्परतरं नास्ति, द्रोणमस्ति ततः परं.

I have digressed rather far in the matter of the identification of Krimikantha-Chōla with Kulōttunga I and let me now resume the history of Rāmānuja. Hearing of the death of Kulōttunga I at Gangaikoṇḍacōḷapuram, Rāmānuja prepared to start for Śrīrangam. Before doing so, he placed the affairs of the temple at Tirunārāyaṇapuram on a firm basis, and visited the temple at Tirupati where he permanently decided, in favour of the Vaiṣṇavas, the dispute between the Śaivas and the Vaiṣṇavas concerning the Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava nature of the local deity. He returned to Śrīrangam eleven years before his death, according to a stanza of the *Rāmānujārya Divya Caritam*, which runs thus:—

ஆய்ந்த சகாப்த மாயிரத்தைம்பத் தொன்பதி னீங்கிநின்றும்
போந்து பதினோராண்டிங்ஙன் புகழ்தான் வளர்ந்த பெரும்புதூர்
வேந்த னெண்ணிலாவன் பருடனு மரங்க நகரெய்திப்
பாந்தளணைத் துயில்பரமன் பாதம் பணிந்தங் குறைந்திருந்நாள். 6

Rāmānujārya-Divya Caritam, page 227.

Then the same work goes on to say that, just after his return to Śrīrangam, Rāmānuja finished the remaining third of his Bhāṣyam. This must evidently have been after 1039 Śaka (1117 A.D.) and before 1059 Śaka (A.D. 1137). Hence the conclusion we have stated above regarding the completion of the work in 1047 Śaka seems to be correct.

The closing period of Rāmānuja's life was one of *otium cum dignitate*. All his troubles were at an end. The new Cōḷa king was his patron (so the Vaiṣṇava accounts say and the inscriptions warrant us in believing the statement). Thus Rāmānuja enjoyed his well-earned repose for nearly 10 years before he died in 1059 Śaka (A.D. 1137). He had nominated Parāśara-bhaṭṭa, son of Kūrattāḷvān as his successor, long before he died.

The chief event in the life of Bhaṭṭar is the conversion of a famous Vēdāntin named Mādhava, a native of some place in Mysore, who took holy orders under the name of Nañjīyar. He quickly mastered the Drāviḍa Vēdas (the *Nālāyira-prabandham*) and wrote a commentary on the *Tiruvāymoḷi*. There is a belief among the Śrīvaiṣṇavas that Bhaṭṭar died very early. Relying on this, Aṇṇā-appangār in his "*Paḷanaḍai-Viḷakkam*" says that he died in his 28th year (pages 4, 5). Bhaṭṭar, we know, was born before the Cōḷa persecution which took place in A.D. 1078 and Rāmānuja died in A.D. 1137. Bhaṭṭar succeeded Rāmānuja and continued to live some time. It might be that he lived for 28 years after Rāmānuja, which the orthodox people assume to be the whole age of Bhaṭṭar. Even assuming that Bhaṭṭar was born in the very year in which his father lost his eyes, Bhaṭṭar was at least 60 years old when he died. If he lived for another 28 years after Rāmānuja, he must have been more than 88 years at the time of his death. His death may

acknowledged by those latter as their gurus. Rāmānuja himself treated Tirukkacācinambi, a sudra disciple of Āḷavandāṛ, as his teacher. Rāmānuja used to go to bathe in the Kāverī supporting himself on the arms of a Brahman disciple of his, but on his return from the river he invariably took for his support Pillai Urangavalli-desar, a sudra. Maraneri Nambi, one of the disciples of Ālavandār, is said to have belonged to the Pañcama caste; so was Vilanjolai Pillai, a disciple of Pillai Lokācharya.

In his largeness of heart for his suffering humanity, Rāmānuja was second only to Buddha. When his *guru* Tirukkottiyur Nambi enjoined upon him to keep secret certain *rahasyarthas* taught by him, he broke the commands of his guru in this respect and taught the secret doctrines freely to all; and when questioned by his master, he stated that by breaking his promise to his ācārya he might go to hell, but that all the souls that learnt the *rahasya* would attain heaven. In consideration of the redemption of so many souls, he was prepared to sacrifice his single soul.

It is believed by some people that Rāmānuja admitted among the Brāhmaṇas a large number of people of other castes. He never did any such thing. It is calumnious to attribute such an absurd act to this great *āchārya* and such belief argues ignorance on the part of the believers even of the rudiments of Śrivaiṣṇavaism.

Death of Periyanambi	Śaka 1001 (=A.D. 1079).
Desecration of the Govindaraja temple by Kulottunga	Śaka 1009 (=A.D. 1087).
Setting up of the 5. Nārāyaṇas ...	Śaka 1039 (=A.D. 1117).
Death of the persecuting Chōḷa ...	Śaka 1039 (=A.D. 1117).
Return to Srīraṅgam and finishing of the Śrībhaṣyam	Śaka 1048 (=A.D. 1126).
Death of Rāmānuja	Śaka 1059 (=A.D. 1137).

I. दिव्यसूरिचरितम्.

(१) श्रीकासारसूरिणोऽवतारः பொய்கையார்.

"हेमाब्जिनीहेमसरोजगर्भाच्छ्रीपञ्चजन्योऽजनि तत्र योगी ।
तारे हरेराश्वयुजाख्यमासे समस्तजीवावनकर्महेतोः ॥"

(२) श्रीभूतसूरिणोऽवतारः பூதத்தார்.

"मासेथ तस्मिन्वसुभेऽजनिष्ट पारेसमुद्रं पुरि मल्लनाम्न्याम् ।
नीलोत्पलान्ताद्भुवि भूतनामा कौमोदकीशक्तिमयो मुनीन्द्रः ॥"

(३) श्रीमहदाह्वयसूरिणोऽवतारः பேயாழ்வார்.

"तन्मास एवाविरभूद्विपश्चित् प्राचेतसर्क्षेथ मयूरपुर्याम् ।
महाभिधानो लतिकाह्रदान्तात् श्रीनन्दकात्मा मणिकैरवान्तात् ॥"

(४) श्रीभक्तसारसूरिणोऽवतारः திருமழிசையாழ்வார்.

"पपात गर्भो भुवि तैष्यमासे मखाभिधाने महनीयतारे ।"

(५) श्रीशठगोपसूरिणोऽवतारः நம்மாழ்வார்.

"राधे कलिदिने लाभे वैशाखे काव्यवासरे ।
लग्ने कर्कटकेऽसूत तनयं नाथनायिका ॥"

(६) श्रीमधुरकविसूरिणोऽवतारः மதுரகவியாழ்வார்.

"चैत्रे मासि ततश्चित्रातारकायामजायत ।"
"चक्रे तं जनको नाम्ना मधुरोपपदं कविम् ॥"

(७) श्रीकुलशेखरसूरिणोऽवतारः குலசேகராழ்வார்.

"तस्याममूच्चेरकुलप्रदीपः श्रीकौस्तुभात्मा कुलशेखराख्यः ।
महीपतिर्माघपुनर्वसूद्यद्दिने हरे पूर्णकटाक्षलक्ष्यः ॥"

(८) श्रीभट्टनाथसूरिणोऽवतारः பெரியாழ்வார்.

"ज्येष्ठेऽथ मासे पवमानतारे श्रेष्ठो गुणेनाजनि भट्टनाथः ।"

(९) श्रीभक्ताङ्घ्रिरेणुसूरिणोऽवतारः தொண்டரடிப் பொடியார்.

"तत्रोदभूद्भागवताद्द्विजेन्द्राज्ज्येष्ठाख्यभे मासि च मार्गशीर्षे ।
श्रीविप्रनारायणनामधेयो मुरारिवक्षोवनमालिकांशः ॥"

(१०) श्रीपाणनाथसूरिणोऽवतारः திருப்பாணாழ்வார்.

"समजायत पाणसंज्ञकः सुकविः कार्तिकमासि वैदभे ।"

(११) श्रीपरकालसूरिणोऽवतारः திருமங்கையாழ்வார்.

"समजायत तत्र पादजप्रमुखः कश्चन नीलनामकः ।
पुरुषोत्तमकार्मुकांशजस्स्फुरिते कार्तिककृत्तिकोडुनि ॥"

(१२) श्रीगोदादेव्यवतार. ஆண்டாள்.

"शुभे मुहूर्ते शुचिमासि फल्गुनीप्रतीततारे तुलसीवनान्तरे ।
भुवोऽभवत्काचन बालकन्यका . . . . . . ॥"
"वसुतिथिबुधरोहिणीजयन्तीदिननिशिनाभसमासि कृष्णपक्षे ।
स्वजननमहमातनोत्सरङ्गी स्नपनसुभक्ष्यशुभोदनार्घभेदैः ॥
हरितनुपरिवर्तनक्रियार्हैर्हरिदिवसे हरिमासि रङ्गराजः ।
निखिलहरिगणैर्निषेव्यमाणो महितपवित्रमहोत्सवोत्सुकोऽभूत् ॥"

(१३) श्रीरामानुजावतारः —

"आर्द्रे भे समजनि चैत्रमासि तस्मादार्द्रात्मा बहुलकृपारसेन कश्चित्"

II. பின்பழகிய பெருமாள் ஜீயர் குருபரம்பரை.

1. ஐப்பசிமாசத்திலே விஷ்ணுநக்ஷத்திரமான ஸ்ரீவண நக்ஷத்ரத்திலே பொய்கையாழ்வார் அவதரித்தருளினார்.
2. ஐப்பசிமாசத்திலே அவிட்ட நக்ஷத்திரத்திலே பூதத்தாழ்வார் அ.
3. ஐப்பசிமாசத்திலே சதய நக்ஷத்திரத்திலே பேயாழ்வார அவ.
4. தைமாஸத்திலே மகா நக்ஷத்திரத்தில் திருமழிசைப்பிரான் அவ. திருமழிசைப் பிரான் தியானம்பண்ணிக்கொண்டு யோகத்திலே 2,300 ஸம்வத்சரமெழுந்தருளியிருந்தார். Total length of his life 4,700 years.
5. கலியுகம்பிறந்த நாற்பத்து மூன்றுநாளான வர்த்தமான பஹுதான்ய வருஷத்தில் வஸந்தருதுவில், வைகாசிமாஸம் சுக்லபக்ஷம் பௌர்ணமி

கூடின திருவைசாக நக்ஷத்ரத்தில் காவ்யவாஸர கர்க்கடக லக்நத்திலே திவ்யயோக திவ்யகரணங்களிலே ஆதித்ய ராம திவாகராச்யுத பாநுக்கள் உதயத்திலே, வகுளபூஷண பாஸ்கரோதய முண்டாய்த்து (Nammāḻvār born).

6. *சேரன் குலசேகரராய்க்கொண்டு க்ஷத்ரியவர்ணத்திலே மாசிமாஸத்தில் புனர்ப்பூச நக்ஷத்ரதில் வந்தவதரித்தருளினார்.*

7. *வேயர்தங் குலத்திலே ஆனிமாஸத்திலே திருச்சோதியிலே அவதரித்து விஷ்ணுசித்தர் என்கிற திருநாமத்தை யுடையவராயிருப்பர்.*

8. *திருவாடிப் பூரத்திலே "பார்வண்ண மடமங்கை" என்கிற ஸ்ரீபூமிபிராட்டி ஆண்டாளாக ஆவிர்ப்பவித்தருளினார்.*

9. *மார்கழி மாஸத்தில் கேட்டை நக்ஷத்திரத்தில் தொண்டரடிப் பொடியாழ்வார் அவதரித்தருளினார்*

10 *கார்த்திகை மாஸத்தில் ரோஹிணீ நக்ஷத்திரத்திலே திருப்பாணாழ்வார் அவதாரம்.*

11. *நளவருஷம் கார்த்திகைமாஸம், கார்த்திகை நக்ஷத்ரம் திருமங்கையாழ்வார் அவதாரம்.*

12. *சித்திரைமாஸம் சித்ரா நக்ஷத்ரத்தில் ஸ்ரீமதுரகவிகள் நம்மாழ்வாருக்கு முன்னே, சூரியோதயத்திற்குமுன் அருணோதயம்போல் அவதரித்தருளினார்.*

13. *"இவ்வாழ்வார்கள் தன்னுடைச் சோதிக்கெழுந்தருளி நெடுங்காலம் கழிந்தவாறே, வீரநாராயண புரத்திலே மன்னனார் திருவடிகளிலே ஸர்வவிதகைங்கர்யங்களையும் செய்துகொண்டுபோகிற ஈசுவர பட்டாழ்வாரும், அவர் குமாரர் நாதமுனிகளும், அவர் குமாரர்—ஈசுவரமுனியும். திருநகரிக்கெழுந்தருளி, அங்கே ஸ்ரீ மதுரகவிகளுடைய சிஷ்யரான ஸ்ரீ பராங்குசதாசரை சேவித்து, இவ்விடத்திலே திருவாய்மொழி யோதினவர்களுண்டோ? . . . "திருவாய்மொழி முதலான திவ்ய பிரபந்தங்களை அடியேனுக்கு இரங்கியருளவேணும்" என்ன, திருவாய் மொழியையும் மற்றுமுள்ள மூவாயிர ப்ரபந்தங்களையும் (நம்மாழ்வார்) பிரசாதித்தருளினார்."*

The Divyasūricaritram states that, Nāthamuni seeing Nammāḻvār being in a deep trance (*சமாதி*), did not want to disturb him. He asked Madhurakavi to instruct him how to awake Nammāḻvar. He tells him to repeat a certain verse several times. Pleased with him Nammāḻvār gave him *his own* works only.

Nāthamuni is said to have died in Gangaikoṇḍasolapuram.

Āḻavandār his grandson was not yet born when Nathamunigal died.

14. *உய்யக்கொண்டார் திருநக்ஷத்திரம் சித்திரையில் கார்த்திகை.*

15. *ஆடிமாஸத்தில் உத்திராடத்தில் ஆளவந்தார் பிறந்தார்.*

16. *மணக்கால்நம்பி திருநக்ஷத்ரம் மாசியில் மகம்*

17. **𑌧𑍀𑌰𑍍𑌲𑌬𑍍𑌧𑌾** *என்கிற கணக்கின்படியே சகவருஷம் 939 சென்ற வர்த்தமான பிங்கள ஸம்வத்சரத்தில் ஸ்ரீமத்தான சைத்ரமாஸத்தில் சுக்லபக்ஷத்தில் பஞ்சமி குருவாரம் திருவாதிரை நக்ஷத்ரத்தில் சுபமுகூர்த்தத்திலே ராமானுஜர் ஜனித்தார்.*

18. *க்ரோதனஸம்வத்சரத்தில் தைமாஸமும் பௌர்ணமியும் ஸோமவாரமும் கூடின புனர்ப்பூச நக்ஷத்ரத்தில் கோவிந்தபட்டர்* (cousin of Rāmānuja) *அவதரித்தார்.*

19. Death of Aḻavandār. *வைகாசிமாஸம் ஆருந்தேதி ஸ்ரீ வண நக்ஷத்திரம, அபிஜின் முஹூர்த்தம்.*

20. பஹுதாந்ய ஸம்வத்ஸரம் தைமாசம்: சகவர்ஷம் ஆயிரத்துக்கு மேல் பன்னிரண்டு சென்ற வர்த்தமாந பஹுதாந்ய வருஷம், தைமாஸம் சுகலபக்ஷ சதுர்தசியும் வியாழக்கிழமையும் கூடின புனர்பூச நட்சத்திரத்திலே திருநாராயணன் உருவங் கண்டுபிடிக்கப்பட்டது.

21. திருக்கோட்டியூர் நம்பி திருநட்சத்ரம் வைகாசியில் ரோஹணீ
22. திருமாலையாண்டான் திருநட்சத்ரம் மாசி மகம்.
23. திருவரங்கப் பெருமாளரையர் திருநட்சத்ரம் வைகாசியில் சேட்டை.
24. பெரியதிருமலைநம்பி திருநட்சத்ரம், சித்திரையில் சுவாதி.
25. கூரத்தாழ்வான் திருநட்சத்ரம் தையில் ஹஸ்தம்.
26. Death of Rāmānuja: धर्मो नष्टः Ś. 1059.

Bhaṭṭar's contemporary is said to be Tribhuvanavīradēvarāya (Kulōttunga III ?).

27. Bhaṭṭar திருநட்சத்ரம் வைகாசியில் அநுராதம்.
28. Death of Nanjīyar (திருநட்சத்ரம்) பங்குனியில் உத்தரம்.

III. மணவாளமாமுனிகளருளிச்செய்த உபதேசரத்நமாலை.

The dates of the āḻvārs and Rāmānuja are same as in பின்பழகிய பெருமாள் ஜீயர்.

He does not give the dates of others.

IV. அப்பிள்ளை திருவாய்மலர்ந்தருளிய வாழித்திருநாமம்.

The dates of the āḻvārs are the same as in பின் பழகிய பெருமாள் ஜீயர் குருபரம்பரை

நாதமுனிகள்: ஆனதனிலனுடத்தி லவதரித்தான் வாழியே.

உய்யக்கொண்டார்: சித்திரையில் கார்த்திநால் சிறக்கவந்தோன் வாழியே.

மணக்கால்நம்பி: மாசிமகந்தனில் விளங்க வந்துதித்தான் வாழியே.

ஆளவந்தார்: கடகவுத்திராடத்துக்கா லுதித்தான் வாழியே.

பெரியநம்பி: ஓங்குதனு கேட்டைதனி லுதித்தான்வாழியே.

திருக்கச்சிநம்பி: மாசி மிருகசீரிடத்தில் வந்துதித்தான் வாழியே.

பெரும்பூதூர் முனிவன்: Rāmānuja சித்திரையிலாதிரைநாள் சிறக்கவந்தோன் வாழியே.

கூரத்தாழ்வான்: எராருந்தையிலத்தத் திங்குவந்தான் வாழியே,

முதலியாண்டான்: சித்திரையில் புனர்பூசம் சிறக்கவந்தோன் வாழியே.

திருவரங்கத்தமுதனார்: பங்குனியிலத்தநாள் பாருதித்தான் வாழியே.

எம்பார்: மகரத்தில் புனர்ப்பூசம் வந்துதித்தான் வாழியே.

பட்டர்: வையாசியனுடத்தில் வந்துதித்தான் வாழியே.

நஞ்சீயர்: பங்குனியிலுத்திரநாள் பாருதித்தான் வாழியே

நம்பிள்ளை: கார்த்திகை கார்த்திகை யுதித்தகலிகன்றி வாழியே.

வடக்கு திருவீதிப்பிள்ளை: ஆனிதனிற் சோதிநாள் அவதரித்தான் வாழியே.

பிள்ளை லோகாசாரியார்: ஐப்பசியிற் றிருவோணத் தவதரித்தான் வாழியே.

கூரகுலோத்தம தாஸர்: இலகுதுலாவாதிரையில் லிங்குதித்தான் வாழியே.

திருவாய்மொழிப்பிள்ளை : வைகாசி விசாகத்தில் வந்துதித்தான் வாழியே.

மணவாளமாமுனிகள்: ஐப்பசியிற் றிருமூலத் தவதரித்தான் வாழியே.

V. பிள்ளை லோகார்ய ஜீயர் அருளிச்செய்த யதீந்திரப்ரவண ப்ரபாவம்.

Birth of Maṇavāḷamāmuṇigaḷ : கலியுகம் பிறந்து நாலாயிரத்து முந்நூற்று எழுபத்தொரு வருஷத்திற்கு பின்பு ஸாதாரணவருஷம் ஐப்பசி மாத்தில் சுக்கிலபட்சத்தில் சதுர்த்தி வியாழக்கிழமையுங்கூடின திருமூல நட்சத்திரத்திலே அவதரித்தார்.

Re-setting of the image of Ranganatha in the temple at Srīrangam by Gopaṇārya :—

பஹுதாபிரியமான (a mistake for बन्धुप्रिय) சகாப்தம் ஆயிரத்திரு நூறு சென்ற (a corresponding mistake for 12925) வர்த்தமாந பரீதாபி நாம ஸம்வத்ஸரம் வைகாசி மாசம் பதினேழாந்தேதியில்........................

Death of Tirumalaiyāḷvār (Śrīśailēśa, the guru of Maṇavāḷamāmuṇigaḷ) வைசாக பஹுள அஷ்டமி.

மணவாளமாமுனி lived for 73 years.

" மாசிமால்பக்கத் துவாதசிமா மணிமண்டபத் தெய்தினனே ".

कुम्भं भास्वति याति तत्सुतदिने पक्षे वलक्षेतरे
द्वादश्यां श्रवणर्क्षभाजि रुधिरोद्गार्याख्यसंवत्सरे ।
धीभक्त्यादिगुणार्णवो यतिवराधीनाखिलात्मस्थितिः
श्रीवैकुण्ठमकुण्ठवैभवमगात्कान्तोपयन्ता मुनिः ॥

VI. பிள்ளை லோகஞ் ஜீயர் அருளிச்செய்த ராமானுஜார்ய திவ்யசரிதை.

Birth of Rāmānuja : கலியுகம்பிறந்து நாலாயிரத்தொருநூற்றுப் பதினெட்டு வருஷத்துப்பின்பு, பிங்களவருஷம் சித்திரைமாசம் சுக்கிலபட்சம் பஞ்சமி குருவாரம், திருவாதிரையிலே சுபமுஹூர்த்தத்தில், கர்க்கடக லக்நத்தில் அவதரித்தார்.

Birth of Gōvinda : அவ்வருஷம் தைமாஸம் பூர்ண சந்த்ரவாஸரம் புனர்பூசத்தில்.

Birth of Mudaliyāṇḍan :—

स्वर्गीयाभशरद्गतौ कलियुगे संवत्सरे श्रीमुखे
चैत्रे मासि सितद्युतावुपचितावष्टादशे चाहनि ।
षष्ठ्यामिन्दुदिने रघुप्रवरभे वाधूलवंश्याग्रणीः
जज्ञे दाशरथिर्हि यस्य महितो रामानुजो मातुलः ॥

Birth of Kūrattāḷvāṉ :—

कल्यब्दे कलिपावने मकरगे सूर्ये च शुक्लोत्तरे
वर्षे भानुतदीयवासरवरे पक्षे च शुक्लोत्तमे ।
पञ्चम्यां करिशैलनेतुरनघे नक्षत्रवर्ये च यः
श्रीवत्साङ्कसुधीरवातरदसौ भूलोकपुण्योदयः ॥

Udayavar is said to have lived for sixty years before he was persecuted by the Cōla king (?).

Discovering the image of Tirunārāyaṇapperumāl.

சகாப்தம் தொள்ளாயிரத்தொருபதுடன் பின்னு—(கூஙுரா—must be read thus)—மோராண்டு சென்ற வர்த்தமாநம் பஹுதாந்ய ஸம்வத்ஸரம் தைமாஸம் சுக்லபக்ஷ சதுர்த்தசியும் வியாழக்கிழமையுங் கூடின புனர்ப்பூசத்திலே.

Rāmānuja is stated to have lived in Mēlukōṭe for twelve years.

Death of Periyanambi:—

कालयुक्त्यष्टकामध्यतिथिप्रोक्तामहागुरोः ।
यामुनार्यपदाम्भोजशुश्रूषायाऽभवत्सदा ॥

Mudaliyāṇḍāṉ is sent to Vēlūr (Bēlūr, the Capital of the Hysaḷers) to set up five Nārāyaṇa images in five different places.

ஆய்ந்த சகாப்தமாயிரதைம்பத் தொன்பதி நீங்கி நின்றும்
போந்து பதிஞோராண்டிங்ஙன் புகழுதான் வளர்ந்த பெரும்பூதூர்
வேந்த னெண்ணிலா வன்பருடனுமாங்க நகரெய்திப்
பாந்தளணைத் துயில்பரமன் பாதம் பணிந்தங்குறைந்திடுநாள்.

Senni Kulōttuṅga throws in the sea the image of Vishṇu from the temple at சிதம்பரம் in Ś. 1009.

The Śrībhāṣya is said to have been finished in Ś. 1077 (a mistake, as I take it, for Ś. 1047).

Six months after the death of கூரத்தாழ்வான், முதலியாண்டான் also dies.

VII. The dates according to the பெரிய திருமுடியளவு are already given and so I don't repeat them here.

VIII. குருபரம்பரா பிரபாவம் of Tṛtīya Brahma Tantra Svatantarasvāmi.

பொய்கையாழ்வார்: துவாபரயுகத்தில் 862901 வதான சித்தார்த்திரி வருஷம் ஐப்பசி மீ சுக்லாஷ்டமி, செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை, திருவோண நட்சத்திரம்.

Bhūtattāḷvar—next day. அவிட்ட நட்சத்ரம்.

பேயாழ்வார்—next day, சதைய நட்சத்ரம்.

திருமழிசையார்—same year. தைமாசம் கிருஷ்ண பிரதமை பானுவாரம் மகாநட்சத்திரத்தில்.

நம்மாழ்வார்—கலி 43rd day. பிரமாதி வருஷம், வைகாசிமீ பௌர்ணமி வெள்ளிக்கிழமை கூடின விசாக நட்சத்ரம்.

மதுரகவி—துவாபரயுகம், 863879th year, ஈசுவர௵ சித்திரைமீ சுக்கில சதுர்த்தசி வெள்ளிக்கிழமை கூடின சித்திரை நட்சத்ரம்.

குலசேகரர்—கலி 28th year, பராபவவருஷம் மாசிமீ சுக்ல துவாதசி வெள்ளிக்கிழமை கூடின புநர்வசு நட்சத்ரம்.

பெரியாழ்வார்—கலி 47-வது வருஷம், குரோதன, ஆனிமீ சுக்ல ஏகாதசி பானுவாரங் கூடின சுவாதி நட்சத்ரம்.

ஆண்டாள்—கலி 98th year நளவருஷம், ஆடிமாசம் சுக்ல சதுர்த்தசி செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை கூடின பூர நட்சத்ரம்.

தொண்டரடிப்பொடி—கலி 289th year *பிரபவஸு மார்கழிமீ கிருஷ்ண சதுர்த்தசி, செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை கூடின கேட்டை நட்சத்ரம்.*

திருப்பாணாழ்வார்—கலியுகத்தில் 343rd year *தார்மஸு கார்த்திகைமீ கிருஷ்ண துவிதியை புதன்கிழமை கூடின ரோகிணி நட்சத்ரம்.*

திருமங்கையார்—கலி 398-வதுஸு, நளவருஷம் கார்த்திகைமீ பௌர்ணமி வியாழக்கிழமை கூடின க்ருத்திகா நட்சத்ரம்.

நாதமுநிகள்—கலியுகத்தில் சோபக்ருதுஸு ஆனிமீ அனுஷம்.

ஆளவந்தார்—ஆடிமீ உத்திராடம்.

ராமானுஜர்—கலி 4119 வதான பிங்களஸு சித்திரைமீ திருவாதிரை நட்சத்திரத்தில் அவதாரம்.

கோவிந்தபட்டர்—க்ரோதனஸு தைமீ பௌர்ணமி புநர்வஸு நட்சத்ரம்.

Tirunārāyaṇapperumāḷ image discovered: *சகவர்ஷம் 1021 ஆன பகுதாந்ய வருஷம் பங்குனிமீ சுக்ல சதுர்த்தசி குருவாரங்கூடின புனர்வஸு நட்சத்ரம்.*

Rāmānuja lived for 120 years.

Birth of *வேதாந்த தேசிகர்—கலி 4370-க்கு மேல் சுக்ல வருஷம் புரட்டாசி மாசம் சுக்லதசமி புதன்கிழமை கூடின திருவோண நட்சத்ரம்.*

Dēśika said to be the contemporary of Vidyāraṇya, Akshobhya Tīrtha, a younger contemporary of śudarśana bhaṭṭar, Kṛṣṇamiśra (author of *Prabōdhacandrodayam*), Diṇḍima-kavi, Pīḷḷailōkāchārya, and Sarvajña-Śinga Nāyaka.

Birth of Nayinarācārya, son of Dēśika: *நள வருஷம் ஆவணிமீ ரோகணி நட்சத்ரம்.*

Invasion of the South by the Musalmans.

Reinstating the image of Ranganātha in Srīrangam.

Setting up anew the image of Visṇu in the temple at Cidambaram (the original being thrown long ago by Kulōttuṇga in the sea) by the help of Goppaṇārya.

Dēśika lived for 100 years and died in *சௌமியஸு கார்த்திகைமீ.*

Nayinarācārya was the contemporary of *மணவாளமாமுனி.*

Death of Nayinarācārya: *ஜயஸு பங்குனி மீ கிருஷ்ண ஸப்தமி.*

IX. கோயிலொழுகு.

குலசேகரப்பெருமாள், கல்யப்தம் ஐம்பது வருஷத்துக்குமேல், சேர சோழ பாண்டிய மண்டலங்களுக்கு ப்ரபுவாய்......

கல்யப்தம் 445-ஸுக்குமேல் ஆழ்வார் திருமங்கையாழ்வார் தினம் திருவரங்கந் திருப்பதியிலே நித்யவாசம் பண்ணிக்கொண்டு..........

கல்யப்தம் 105-க்குமேல், ஸ்ரீவில்லிபுத்தூரிலே அழகியமணவாளன் ரங்க மன்னாராக எழுந்தருளி, சூடிக்கொடுத்த நாச்சியாரைத் திருமணம் புணர்ந்து..........

Birth of Nāthamunigaḷ—Kali 3924.

Invasion of the Musalmans as far as Conjeeveram. *சகாப்தம் ஆயிரத்து நூற்று நாற்பத்தொன்பதுக்குமேல் அட்சய வருஷம்.* (This must be read as *ஆயிரத்துஇருநூற்று நாற்பத்தொன்பதுககுமேல்*)........

Reinstating the image of Ranganatha in Srīrangam by Goppanārya: *சகாப்தம் 1293ல் செல்லாநின்ற பரீதாபிஸு வைகாசிமீ 17உ.*

Boundary between Srīrangam and Jambukēśvaram marked in Ś. 1297, நள, பங்குனியீ.

Uttamanambi gets for Ranganatha a number of villages from Harihara (II) from Ś. 1304, Rudhirodgari to Iśvara (15 years.)

श्रीमच्छकाब्दे नवलोक(Ś. 1340)भाजि विकारिणि ह्युत्तमनंबिनाम्नः।
वेदार्थभट्टो धुरि तिम्मराजो वितीर्य पत्रं समयं तदाग्रहीत ॥

எல்லை நிலையிட்ட உத்தமநம்பி obtained several villages to Ranganatha and titles to himself and his brother in Ś. 1343, ப்லவ. He was contemporary of Gajavēṭṭai-Pratāpa Dēvarāya (II ?).

மணவாள மாமுனி's assumption of the Sanyasāśrama : Ś. 1347, பார்த்திவஹு.

(Other dates are more useful for political rather than religious history.

X. ஸந்நிதி குருபரம்பரை.

The years of the Yugas for āḻvārs, same as in the குருபரம்பரை of Tṛtīya Brahmatantra Svatantra Svāmi.

Birth of நாதமுனி (திருநக்ஷத்ரம்) : Kali 3684, Śōbhakṛt, ஆனி, அனுஷாதம்.

Birth of உய்யக்கொண்டார் : Kali 3927, Parābhava, சித்திரையீ, Kṛttikā nakṣatram.

Birth of Maṇakkālnambi : Kali 3932, Virōdhikṛt, Māśī, Makham.

Birth of Āḷavandār : Kali 4017, Dhātū, Āḍī, Uttirāḍam.

Birth of Periyanambi : Kali 4038, Hemalambi, Mārgaḷi, Kēṭṭai.

Birth of Rāmānuja : Kali 4118, Piṅgala, Cittirai, Tiruvādirai.

Birth of Govindabhatta : Kali 4126, Krōdhana, Tai, Punarvasu.

Birth of Bhaṭṭar : Kali 4163, Śubhakṛt, Vaigāśi, Anurādha.

Birth of Kiḍāmbi Accān : Kali 4158, Hemalambi, Cittirai, Hasta.

Birth of Kiḍāmbi Rāmānuja-ppiḷḷan : Kali 4209, Sarvadhāri, Aippaśi, Pūrāḍam.

Birth of Kiḍāmbi Rangarāya : Kali 4264, Svabhānu, Panguni, Rohini.

Birth of Nambillai : Kali 4030, Prabhava, Kārttigai, Kṛttikā.

Birth of வடக்கு திருவீதி பிள்ளை : Kali 4328, Sarvajit, Āṇi, Svāti.

Birth of திருக்குருகைப் பிரான் பிள்ளான் : Kali 4169, Plavanga, Aippaśi, Pūrāḍam.

Birth of Engaḷāḻvān : Kali 4208, Vyaya, Āṇi, Svāti.

Birth of Naḍādūr-ammāḷ : Kali 4267, Pārthiva, Cittirai, Cittirai.

Birth of Vēdantadeśika : Kali 4370, Vibhava, Purattāśi, Tiruvōṇam.

Birth of Nainārācārya : Kali........, Svabhānu, Purattāśi, Kēṭṭai.

XI. PRAPANNĀMRITAM.

Birth of Rāmānuja :—

एवं गते बहुतिथे तस्यां जज्ञे महामतिः ।
चैत्रे मेषे शुक्लपक्षे पञ्चम्यां गुरुवासरे ॥
मध्याह्ने कर्कटे लग्ने नक्षत्रे रुद्रदैवते ।

(चैत्रार्द्रासंभवम्).

Discovering the image of Tirunārāyaṇapperumāl :—

शकाब्दे वर्षसाहस्रे गते तद्द्वादशाधिके ।
ततोऽब्दे बहुधान्याख्ये पुष्यमासि शुभे तदा ॥
शुक्लपक्षे चतुर्दश्यां सुप्रभावपुनर्वसौ ।
आविर्बभूव भगवांस्तत्र नारायणो हरिः ॥

Death of Rāmānuja :—

रामानुजो जगामाशु तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ।
माघशुद्धदशम्यां तु मध्याह्ने मन्दवासरे ॥
. . . . ।
धर्मो नष्टोभवद्भूम्यामिति सर्वे प्रचुक्रुशुः ॥

Birth of the Mudalāḷvārs :—

द्वापरे चाष्टलक्षेषु सहस्रेषु च षष्टिषु ।   Poygai.
संवत्सरेष्वतीतेषु तथा नवशतेषु च ॥
धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय ततः सिद्धार्थिवत्सरे ।
तुलामासे शुक्लपक्षे ह्यष्टम्यां कुजवासरे ॥
कासारयोगी संजज्ञे नक्षत्रे श्रवणे . . ॥
भूताह्वयो धीमान् वेदान्तिस्तत्परेहनि ।   Bhūtam
मासेथ तस्मिन्वसुभेजनिष्ट . . . . ॥

तत्परेहनि (Pēyāḷvār).

Tirumaḷiśai :—

तं भक्तसारं योगीशं कनकाङ्गी सुवर्चसम् ।
विभवाब्दे पुष्यमासे दशम्यां कृष्णपक्षके ॥
तुलालग्ने भक्तसारो मघायां गुरुवासरे ।
कनकाङ्ग्यां भार्गवस्य जज्ञे चक्रांशतो महान् ॥

Kulaśekhara :—

वर्षे पराभवे मासे कुंभे वै शुक्लपक्षके ।
श्रीमत्पुनर्वसूतारे दशम्यां गुरुवासरे ॥
कौस्तुभांशेन संजज्ञे महात्मा कुलशेखरः ।

Periyālvār :—

ततः क्रोधनवर्षे तु ग्रीष्मर्तौ ज्येष्ठमासके ।
शुक्लपक्षे हरितिथौ सुलग्ने भानुवासरे ।
स्वातितारे . . . . विष्णुचित्तस्ततोजनि ॥

Andal :—

आषाढे पूर्वपक्षे च चतुर्थ्यां भौमवासरे ।
मध्याह्ने पूर्वाफाल्गुन्यां तुलालग्ने शुभे दिने ॥

Tondaradippodi :—

गतेष्वष्टोत्तरशतवत्सरेषु कलौ युगे ।
प्रभवाब्दे धनुर्मासे वेदान्तिन्निन्द्रभे ततः ॥

Tiruppanālvār :—

द्वाविंशत्युत्तरशतवत्सरानन्तरं कलौ ।
दुर्मत्यब्दे कार्तिकाख्ये मासे राकामहातिथौ ॥
रोहिण्यां सौम्यवारे तु श्रीपाणो निचुलापुरे ।

Tirumangai :—

कलौ युगे गताब्दानां सप्तोत्तरशतद्वये ।
नलाब्दे कार्तिके मासि राकायां कृत्तिकोडुनि ॥

Nammālvār :—

ततो वक्ष्ये प्रमाद्यब्दे चादौ कलियुगस्य च ।
एकमासे गते तत्र त्रयोदशदिनोत्तरे ॥
वैशाखायां च वेदान्तिलग्ने कर्कटके शुभे ॥

Madhurakavi :—

द्वापरे चाष्टलक्षेषु सहस्रेषु च षष्टिषु ।
संवत्सरेष्वतीतेषु विद्वत्कतिपयेषु च ॥
विक्रमाब्दे चैत्रमासे शुक्लपक्षे च चैत्रभे ॥

Nathamuni :—

द्विशते च त्रिसाहस्रे चतुर्विंशतिकायुते ।
कलौ युगे गतेऽब्दानां शोभकृन्नामके ततः ॥
संवत्सरे ज्येष्ठमासे राकायां मित्रभे बुधे ।

திருக்கண்ணமங்கையாண்டான் ?

श्रीकृष्णमङ्गलक्षेत्रे कस्मिंश्चिद्दिव्यवेश्मनि ।
ज्येष्ठमासे कृष्णपक्षे श्रवणर्क्षे महायशाः ॥

Death of Nāthamuni :—

त्रिशतं त्रिंशदधिकं वत्सराणां च भूतले ।
उवास नाथयोगीन्द्रो वर्द्धयन्विष्णुदर्शनम् ॥
धात्वब्दे माघमासे तु शुक्लपक्षे तु योगिराट् ।
एकादश्यामवापाथ तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥

Birth of Kurugaikāvalappan (disciple of Nāthamuni) :—

कुरुकायां पौषमासे विशाखायां तदाजनि ।

Birth of Uyyakkōṇḍar (another of his disciples) :—

चैत्रमासे पूर्णिमायां पद्माक्षश्चाथ चित्रभे ।

Birth of Maṇakkālnambi :—

विरोधिवत्सरे माघे . . वै शुक्लपक्षके ।
चतुर्दश्यां मघायां च जज्ञे . सौम्यवासरे ॥

Birth of Āḷavandār :—

धात्वब्दे कर्कटे मासि पौर्णमास्यां भृगोर्दिने ।
मित्रभे रङ्गनायक्यां श्रीसिंहासनभागतः ॥
मतिमानीश्वरमुनेः जज्ञे कश्चित्सुतो महान् ।

ஸ்ரீமாறனை நம்பி :—

चतुर्थवर्णे ह्याश्लेषानक्षत्रे मासि कर्कटे ।

லக்ஷ்மணதேசிகர் = ராமானுஜர் :—

शालिवाहशकाब्दानां तत्राष्टत्रिंशदुत्तरे ।
गते नवशते श्रीमान्यतिराजोऽजनि क्षितौ ॥
चैत्रमासे शुक्लपक्षे पञ्चम्यामथ कर्कटे ।

लग्ने श्रीलक्ष्मणांशेन ह्यार्द्रायां गुरुवासरे ॥
आसूरिकेशवाचार्यात्कान्तिमत्यामजायत ।

கோவிந்தர் :—

"गोविन्दः पद्मनेत्रार्यात् द्युतिमत्यामजायत ;
मकरे हस्तनक्षत्रे . . . . ॥"

கூரேசர் :—

माघमासे पुनर्वस्वां दशम्या भरतांशनः ।
लक्ष्मीजनन्यां संजज्ञे वाधूलानन्तदीक्षितात् ॥

எந்நாட நாதர்=முதலியாண்டான (रामानुजदास) :—

तदेव जन्मनक्षत्रं तस्य माघपुनर्वसुः ।

Death of Rāmānuja :—

माघशुद्धदशम्यां तु मध्याह्ने मन्दवासरे ।
भोगिराजः स्वभोगीशभावं सम्प्राप सादरम् ॥

Birth of Piḷḷailōkāchārya :—

अभिरामवराधीशः सर्वशास्त्रविशारदः ।
धनुर्मासे धनिष्ठायां श्रीवत्सान्वयशेखरः ॥

22nd March 1918. T. A. GOPINATHA RAO.

NOTES.

The *Divyasūricaritam* and the *Guruparamparā* of Pinpaḻagiyaperumal Jiyar are the earliest accounts of the Āḻvārs and ācāryas. The latter quotes freely the former and is therefore much later than that work. The author of the Divyasūricaritam stops with the life of Rāmānuja, at the end of which he states that Rāmānuja was not yet dead ; consequently we may take it that the author was contemporary with Rāmānuja. It must be noted that neither the Divyasūricaritam nor the Guruparamparā of Pinpaḻagiyaperumal Jiyar quote any Kali or Śāka years for the Āḻvārs and ācāryas, except in the case of Nammāḻvār. In the case of Nammāḻvār we read in the Divyasūricaritam.

राधे कालिंदिने लाभे = Kali 43rd day which is repeated by the Guruparamparā.

The Guruparamparā gives *Naḷa* (the cyclic year) for Tirumaṅgaiyāḻvār.

The Divyasuricaritam states that when Nāthamuni went to Āḻvār-Tirunagari for obtaining the works of the Āḻvārs, Nammāḻvār and Madhurakavi were alive, but the latter was in deep Samādhi. By Madhurakavi's advice he repeated கண்ணிநுண் சிறுத் தாம்பு several thousand times which pleased Nammāḻvār who woke up from his trance and gave himself to Nāthamuni his own works only.

The Guruparamparā, on the other hand, states that the person met by Nāthamuni at Tirunagari was Parānkuśadāsa, a disciple of Madhurakavi and that Nammāḻvār gave him the works of *all* the āḻvārs *in a dream.*

Dating facts in the Kali and Śaka eras comes into vogue after the time of Maṇavāḷamamunigal. Pillailokan Jiyar uses these eras in his *Rāmānujārya divyacaritam* and *Yatnidrapravaṇa parbhāvam.*

The dating in the kali era is found in the Tṛitīya Brahmatantrasvatantra Jiyar's Guruparamparā with a fullness which is disgusting to me. He gives every astronomical details of the dates of the earlier persons, the āḻvārs, but is unable to givè for those who were near him in point of time. Here, the author has calculated backwards these so-called dates.

This Guruparamparā gives Śaka 1021 as the date of the finding out of the image of Tirunārāyaṇa by Rāmānuja at Melukote, which appears more correct than Śaka 1012 given by the Guruparamparā of Pinpaḻagiyaperumāl Jiyar.

The dates of the *koyiloḻugu* may perhaps be depended upon, but for the errors introduced by the scribes.

Sannidhi Guruparamparā only repeats the version of the Tṛitīya Brahmatantrasvatantra Jiyar's Guruparamparā and is a very recent production.

The *Prapannāmritam* is a literal translation in Sanskrit of Pinpaḻagiyaperumal Jiyār's Guruparamparā.

The *Periya-tirumuḍiyaḍaivu* is earlier than 'the *Prapannāmṛitam.*

The only authoritative works therefore are the Divyasūricaritam and the Guruparamparā of Pinpaḻagiyaperumal Jiyar which were written almost contemporaneously with events narrated in them.

T. A. GOPINATHA RAO.

Remarks by the Chairman, Diwan Bahadur L. D. Swamikannu Pillai, M.A., B.L. (Madras), LL.B. (Lond.), I.S.O., Collector of Nellore.

GENTLEMEN,

We have listened to a most interesting series of lectures by Mr. Gopinatha Rao on the early history of Vaiṣṇavaism in Southern India. It is not for me to express the thanks of the public for the most valuable work that he has done in throwing the light of historical criticism upon the more or less florid and highly coloured accounts handed down to us regarding the lives of the ĀḶVĀRS AND ĀCĀRYAS. If I may subjoin any remarks of mine on the present occasion, it will be for the purpose of illustrating a peculiar trait of these legends namely, their simultaneous use and abuse of chronology. However late we may place the date of composition of these legends or of such of them as contain chronological matter, they stand among the earliest historical compositions to be found in this country. It is a notorious fact that the literary genius of ancient India, which was phenomenally pregnant with activity in all other directions, was up to within times comparatively recent, a stranger to the conception of history properly so called. The very exuberance of the Indian imagination appears to have revolted against the production of history of which ancient Indians must have been aware from contemporary examples in Greece, Italy, Egypt and China. Chronology again is generally closely connected with political history, and until India began to have a continuous political history, that is until the Moghul times, there was little inducement for any one to write the history of political events. The ancient Hindu religion again was not one dependent upon single founders or preachers whose name and fame it was necessary to hand down to posterity and hence the absence of such histories as centred round the early propagation of Buddhism, Christianity and Muhammadanism.

When religious founders began to assert their individual tenets in India, we have the first attempts at history and the Vaiṣṇavite legends are among these. Judging from the abundance of chronological details to be found in these legends, I thought at first that I would try my hand at them; and it seemed to me that I succeeded in weaving something like a continuous chain of biographies out of the dates of Alwars found in these books. The chain seemed to work all right from about the beginning of the 8th century A.D. till late into the 14th and 15th centuries and the fact that week-days did not begin to be currently used in Southern India till the beginning of the 8th century A.D. seemed to lend colour to the chronological consistency of this chain. It is a fact that where five chronological elements are to be found in an

Indian date, namely, the VĀRA, THE TITHI, THE NAKṢATRA, THE SOLAR MONTH AND THE DAY OF SOLAR MONTH, as is the case with several of these Āḷvār dates, the exact A.D. year and English equivalent dates can be found by computation. If to these details are added the cyclic year PRABHAVA, VIBHAVA, etc., computation becomes easy as well as fairly certain. With these elements before me, I decided to discard the highly imaginative and improbable citations of the KALI YUGA ERA, which in fact is never found cited in Indian inscriptions of the 7th and 8th centuries A.D. The result, which is expounded in my pamphlet called "Dates of Āḷvārs" seemed to agree generally with the investigations of historical critics and I thought that if they differed by a few decades from my dates, the error was more probably theirs than mine. That was the first time and as I explained in the pamphlet, my arrangement was purely calendrical and not biographical. Mr. Gopinatha Rao to whose lectures I have listened with very great interest has, I am afraid, upset the basis of my structure. He has shown that a good many of these birth-dates are improbable and unacceptable. Now, any date in Indian Chronology is rather difficult to secure but if it turns out to be bad, there is no help for it; and the consequences of the condemnation of a whole series of dates of this kind must make the chronologist revise the hypothesis on which they are based. An Indian date, except in regard to the week-day element (which is planetary without being astronomical), expresses certain easily verifiable astronomical facts and the addition of a week-day makes these facts as useful for purposes of history as if a definite B.C. or A.D. year, month and day had been quoted. A person writing within the last 1,500 years could have extracted these facts, or most of them from a *Pañcāṅga* current in his day—for Pañcāṅgas have been current in India for at least 1,500 years—but if the facts related to a time beyond the reach of PAÑCĀṄGAS current in his day he would have had to calculate them retrospectively. Such retrospective calculation has been done perhaps half a dozen times for determining the dates of events of first-class importance, e.g., the astronomical beginning of KALI YUGA, the date of Buddha's NIRVĀNA, possibly the date of the birth of RĀMA, the date of ŚANKARA and perhaps two or three other dates. Ordinarily this process was beyond the competency of ordinary writers and they therefore preferred in such cases to take all the details from a current PAÑCĀṄGA and to assume that these details would have been true of a time in the remote past about which they were writing. To discover the time of which the details would be astronomically true would, in this latter case, be useful only for the purpose of ascertaining when the details were adopted but not what was the time to which the details were meant to be applied.

If the details found in the legends of the Āḷvārs are not true of the actual times of the Āḷvārs, it follows, that they were true for the time when the histories of the Āḷvārs began to be composed. Mr. Gopinatha Rao has shown that these histories were thought of only about the time of Rāmānuja. My own impression is that with the possible exception of Rāmānuja himself and of events contemporary with his life, the details of dates in regard to the earlier Āḷvārs and Ācāryas were imagined some two centuries later and in fact I have found between the years 1150 and 1250 most of the dates which in my pamphlet "DATES OF ĀLVĀRS," I had supposed to be dates recorded contemporaneously in the 8th and 9th centuries A.D. This is due to the cyclic recurrence of combinations of a particular vara, tithi and nakṣatra. The result of this change of front on my part must be that we are left altogether without any help save that of the historical critic in regard to the times of the Āḷwārs and early Ācāryas, but that is not a result which however regrettable, need excite much surprise. Be it remembered that the details which I try to re-construct were not details of great events or of the death of great preachers, the time of occurrence of which might be noted by contemporaries, but the dates of birth of a number of poor or insignificant persons (though one king and one prime minister perhaps are included in the list) about whose exact date of birth there would have been no information among their contemporaries, much less among people however devoted to them who lived two or three hundred years later. It is this antecedent improbability of any attempt having been made to exactly determine the dates of birth of a number of religious founders who lived in succession to one another that constitutes the chief difficulty in explaining these so-called records. I was at one time inclined to think that if the records were a fact, the means by which they were preserved and committed to writing need not concern us; but I now think that a circumstance so unparalleled in history deserves to be closely questioned. Before the time when parish registers and baptismal records began to be carefully kept, (and this observation applies only to Europe and that before the 12th century A.D.) it would be next to impossible to discover the date of birth of an ordinary person (not being a crowned monarch) however great might have been his subsequent notoriety. This fact can be easily verified from any biographical dictionary. In India the want of baptismal records is, at the present day, and has been for some centuries past, more than replaced by the practice of everybody having his horoscope cast at his birth but the question is when this practice began. There is absolutely nothing to lead us to suppose that the Āḷwārs had their horoscopes cast at their birth, any more than that Rāma had such a horoscope at the time of his birth, although Vālmiki or rather his continuator has recorded it.

What becomes then of these manifold records of the exact moment of birth of the Āḷvārs and Ācaryas? Subsequent generations no doubt kept certain NAKṢATRAS as the NAKṢATRAS of birth of the different Āḷvārs and Ācaryas; and we must suppose that their so-called biographers added to these Nakṣatras, the missing details of dates from current pañcāṅgas little caring whether these details were capable or incapable of verification. In fact we see that successive compilers of GURUPARAMPARĀS have repeated details which I have shown in my pamphlet to be chronologically impossible, without any attempt to verify them. In other cases they have attempted though imperfectly, to correct the details. I must admit that the details brought together in my "Dates of Āḷvārs" are not generally perfect. So far as I can recollect, the only case without a flaw is that of Tirumaṅgaiāḷvār, but the details there given are not sufficient to arrive at a certainty in the matter of date. The details given in other cases up to the time of Rāmānuja had generally to be doctored by me in regard to one or two points in each case so as to bring them into accord with what I then supposed to be the epoch of the Āḷvārs and Ācaryas. In the light of subsequent evidence and of the general verdict of history in regard to the ascertainment of birth-dates of even great men of the times with which we are concerned, I should now look with more than suspicion upon all these birth-dates not excepting one, until we arrive at the epoch when the casting of horoscopes was fairly common in Southern India.

As I observed before, dates of death or of great events are more reliable because there is greater probability of their having been noted and recorded contemporaneously. This is the case with the dates which I have noted in my pamphlet under Rāmānuja and Manavāla Mahāmunigal. If the dates of birth were merely imagined even in regard to these great personages, it becomes possible to account for the preternaturally long lives assigned to some of them, e.g., to NADAMUNIGAL, to ĀLAVANDĀR, to RĀMĀNUJA himself.

I thought that in fairness to the very great pains which Mr. Gopinatha Rao has taken to throw light on this obscure subject, I should remove any misapprehension which may have been created by my first attempt to re-construct the dates of Āḷvārs. I have not hesitated to place before you the weak as well as the strong points of Indian chronology, because I do not think that it answers the purposes of the historian any more than it can answer the purposes of enlightened religion to ignore such human weaknesses as lie on the surface of these legends of Āḷvārs and Ācaryas.

[For further remarks on this subject see paper vii, appended to Vol. I, Part I of *Indian Ephemeris, A.D. 700 to A.D. 1799.*]